

C

R

En

T

OUTLINES OF LECTURES

ON

CHURCH GOVERNMENT

Delivered in Knox College

BY

REV. JOHN J. A. PROUDFOOT, D.D.

1895

Entered, according to the Act of the Parliament of Canada, in the year eighteen hundred and ninety-five, by JOHN J. A. PROUDFOOT, D.D., at the Department of Agriculture.

PRINTED FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE OF STUDENTS.

PRESS OF THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN, TORONTO

CHURCH GOVERNMENT: METHOD.

STATUS QUESTIONIS.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY OF CHURCH POLITY—ADE-
QUATE INFORMATION IN SCRIPTURE IN REFERENCE
TO APOSTOLIC POLITY—GENERAL PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE
IN THE PROSECUTION OF THIS STUDY—PROOF GENERAL
AND SPECIFIC.

THE CHURCH: DEFINITIONS.

CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

AUTHORITATIVE INFORMATION IN REFERENCE TO IT TO
BE FOUND ONLY IN THE SCRIPTURES—THE APOS-
TLES WERE THE FOUNDERS OF THE CHRISTIAN
CHURCH, ITS INFALLIBLE TEACHERS AND LEGIS-
LATORS.

CHURCH OFFICERS.

I.—ORDINARY AND PERMANENT OFFICERS, ARRANGED CHRONOLOGICALLY:

1. Ruling Elders.
2. Deacons.
3. Ministers and Their Powers.

First.

- (1) Government, Associated with Elders.
- (2) To Labour in the Word and Doctrine.
- (3) Right to Ordain Presbyters.

Second.

Source, Nature and Sphere of Church Power.

II.—EXTRAORDINARY AND TEMPORARY OFFICERS:

1. Apostles.
2. Evangelists.
3. Prophets.

CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

AS Prelatists generally appeal to the Early Church Fathers for proof that Prelacy existed at the close of the Apostolic age, and contend that such proof or information is needed to supplement the obscure, inadequate and disputed teachings of Scripture in reference to Church Polity, we shall carefully examine early Patristic literature to ascertain what light it throws on the subject, and what is the value of the so-called historical argument in favour of Prelacy, being careful, however, not to co-ordinate or combine the teaching of the Fathers with that of the Apostles, or to suppose that Polity, partly Apostolic and partly Patristic, can lay claim to the "jus divinum."

It is important to study the Status Quæstionis, because Prelatists are not agreed among themselves, and because they could not be induced to assent to any adequate statement of the subject. The contest in the Church of England on this matter has been maintained with great earnestness since the Tractarian movement at Oxford, and the contemporaneous publication of the Fathers in a form accessible to all.

Eminent Church of England divines who have studied the Ecclesiastical literature of the first two cen-

turies, declare that it is not favourable to Episcopacy as it has existed since the fourth century.

It is a great matter to ascertain the points on which the parties to the controversy on Church Polity are agreed, and also the points on which they differ.

A brief outline of the views of representatives of the Church of England will be presented. The views of Presbyterians and Congregationalists will emerge in the discussion of the general subject.

R. Hooker, A.D. 1553-1600, the ablest Prelatist writer on Church Polity in the sixteenth century, maintained in his first five books that the organization of the Church was not to be deduced from Scripture, but was a thing to be judged and regulated by common sense and convenience. Even if the order of Bishops could be traced in the Early Church, coming out of an antecedent order of some other kind, that did not impugn its divineness, provided it was convenient for the well-being of the Church (Prof. Allen, p. 329). "Hooker's great work against the impugners of the order and discipline was written, not because Episcopalianism is essential, but because its impugners maintained that Presbyterianism is essential and that Episcopalianism is sinful" (Matthew Arnold). Hooker ascribes contentions in reference to Church Polity to the fact that persons do not consider that such matters pertain to positive law; and that positive laws are either permanent or changeable, according as the matter itself is concerning which they are made, whether God or man be the maker of them; for example, the gospel is eternal (Rev. xiv : 6), whereas whole laws of rites and ceremonies are clean abrogated (Vol. I, 273, 275). The orders which were observed in the Apostles' times, are not to be urged

as a rule universally, either sufficient or necessary (Vol. I, p. 169). In Apostolic times that was harmless, which being now revived would be scandalous; as the "oscula sancta" (Rom xvi: 16; II Cor. xiii: 12); also feasts of charity (I Cor. xi.). Useful things were subsequently introduced, providing for the clergy by tithes, the device of almshouses, division of the people into parishes (Vol. I, p. 159). The earnestness with which the Puritans, *i.e.*, the Presbyterians, contended for the "jus divinum" of Presbyterianism alone exasperated Hooker, and led him to endeavour to prove the divine appointment of Episcopacy.

In Vol III, p. 143, he assumes that Episcopacy prevailed in the Church from the time of the Apostles, and that its continuance for 1,500 years is ample proof that "it was ordained of God," p. 148. In addition to the power of administering the Word and sacraments which other Presbyters have, the Bishop has a power of chieftly in government over Presbyters as well as laymen—a pastor even to pastors. The first Bishops were the Apostles (Acts i: 20); the Apostles were Bishops at large. But they might be with restraint; for example, Paul and Peter (Gal. ii: 7-9), John in Asia, James in Jerusalem (Vol. III, p. 151-153).

Titus and Timothy were endued with Apostolic power. Thus Bishops were successors of the Apostles, p. 154. In some things every Presbyter, in some things only Bishops, in some things neither the one nor the other are the Apostles' successors, p. 155. The second thing referred to is "the kind of Episcopal function, whereby they had power to sit as spiritual ordinary judges, both over laity and over clergy. All Churches erected by the Apostles had the same faith, the same sacraments, the same form of public regiment." The

form of government established at first was that the laity or people should be subject to a college of ecclesiastical persons, *e. g.*, the Church at Ephesus was under the oversight of persons called Presbyters or Bishops. These were all placed over one flock or congregation. They were all subject to Paul. But as Paul predicted that emulations, strifes, and contentions would arise, there could be no adequate remedy, except, according to the order of Jerusalem, some one were endued with Episcopal authority over the rest, and therefore is called in Rev. ii. an angel. Surely there must have been by this time a number of congregations in Ephesus, a diocese. Hooker and George Cranmer were both very much opposed to the office of ruling-elder. On the other hand, Presbyterians contended strenuously for it. Hooker's editor, p. xxix., says "*præclarum tamen hunc concessum seniorum tanti faciunt, ut in eo totius Ecclesiæ salutem niti exitiment.*" In Vol. III, p. 128, George Cranmer says that if Presbyterians would confess that Calvin was the founder of the lay-eldership, and meant only in a general sense that it was of divine appointment, then the expediency of the institution might be freely discussed. He was persuaded that if lay elders should take place, divers inconveniences would follow, contempts of the prince and nobility, insolency of the base people. Again in Vol. I, p. 178, it may justly be feared whether our English nobility, when the matter came to trial, would contentedly suffer themselves to be always at the call of a number of mean persons, assisted with the presence of their poor teacher, little or no whit apter to judge than the rest. To Beza's objection to the exercise of discipline by one person as likely to lead to tyranny, Hooker replies that "tyranny is power violently exercised against

order, against law " (Vol. III, p. 284, 85.) In preface, p. xxix., it is said that Hooker's entire book on the lay-eldership was suppressed. It is assumed that this was done by Presbyterians. Keble, who edits Hooker, complains that other eminent divines of the Church of England did not go far enough in support of Episcopacy. This, he says, was due to personal friendship for Lutherans who had given up Apostolic Succession; to the earnest desire of various countries to be delivered from priestly usurpation; to the lowering of the Episcopate by the Council of Trent; to the want of Patristic authority, especially that of Ignatius, which we now have; to the change in the liturgy in King Edward's time, to which they had assented; to fear of the return of Popery. (Preface, pp. lx-lxiv.)

The substance of their argument was: 1. The whole Church being naturally the subject in which all ecclesiastical power resides, may have originally the right of determining how it would be governed. 2. As the Church did determine from very early times to be governed by Bishops, it cannot be right to remove from that government in any country where the same may be maintained consistently with soundness of doctrine, and the rights of the civil magistrate, being Christian. (Preface, p. lxiii.) Rev. G. Jacob, D.D., late head-master of Christ's Hospital, discusses "The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament." His significations of "Church" are substantially the same as those of the Westminster Standards. He attaches much importance to the distinction between the Church invisible and the visible in the interest of sound doctrine, polity, and Christian charity. Anglicans are rebuked for confounding their Church platform with that of the whole Catholic Church. Of this gospel Church, in its highest

and most comprehensive meaning, our Lord Jesus Christ is the Head, the source of life to each member of His body.

"The Apostles were the founders and infallible legislators of the Church, qualified by the commission of Christ," the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, pp. 14, 15; Matt. xxviii: 19, 20; John xx: 21-23; xiv: 26; xvi: 13. This power and authority combined in Matt. xvi: 18, 19 refers to Peter, not to the exclusion of the other Apostles—Eph. ii: 20; Rev. xxi: 14—but in no sense to any others, pp. 16, 17. He indicates the vital connection between Church polity and doctrine. They react powerfully on one another, pp. 18, 19. The more moderate Anglicans who do not denounce the English Reformation as a blunder and a crime, desire to draw as near as they can to the model of the Church as it existed before the supposed commencement of the Papacy—the Nicene period—failing to see that almost all the doctrines and practices which characterize modern Romanism, are to be found in the fourth century, only less intensified, p. 22. The Church of the Apostolic period is the only Church in which there is found an authority justly claiming the acknowledgment of Christian bodies in other times. Neither antiquity, nor purity of form, nor catholicity confers any right to govern or command, but it is the infallible judgment of the Apostles alone which has a legitimate claim to our submission. The Apostles had no successors in their office. Considering Apostolic authority for Church Polity, note the following distinctions: 1. What, according to the Apostolic record, is necessary and of perpetual obligation in the Church. 2. What is non-essential and discretionary, but not necessary, or at all times right or desirable. 3. What is excluded and expressly

forbidden, or virtually, as unsuitable to the Christian dispensation. From the first and last no Church ought ever to deviate. While the Apostles must have instituted some sort of government, yet it was not laid down as strictly as that of Moses, thus allowing the Church to adapt itself to circumstances, pp. 38-42.

The Apostles changed the polity of the Church in their own time, as there was first the ministry of gifts, then of orders ; although the former was not ordained, p. 42. The Apostles ordained elders or bishops who were rulers and exercised authority even over those who had gifts, p. 51. A most remarkable omission, there is no account of the first appointment of Presbyters. The duties belonging to ministers are nowhere formally laid down in the New Testament. P. 55, " In the absence of express injunctions of Apostolic authority, it was competent for any Church, at any time, to alter or add to the functions of deacons or of any other officers in its service." P. 59, Hooker is quoted, who says, " We are not, herein, to think the ordinances of Scripture violated, except there appear some prohibition which has abridged the Church of that liberty." The Episcopate, in the modern acceptation of the term, and as a distinct clerical order, does not appear in the New Testament. Episcopacy was proved to be a good thing in its effects and influence, and may, therefore, so far be said to be of divine origin, because " of all good things God is the author." Writers on Church matters in all ages evinced a tendency to represent the regulations of their own time as precisely those that were made at the beginning, p. 67. Many take the assertions of men who lived one, two, three or more centuries after the Apostles' time—assertions made without any proof at all—as if they sufficiently substantiated any statement respecting Apostles' com-

mands or practices, p. 68. The only Bishops mentioned in the New Testament were simple Presbyters. The commission of Timothy and Titus was evidently temporary and exceptional, p. 73. The tradition in reference to John's appointing Bishops first, appears more than one hundred years after his death, and cannot be relied on. There was no Bishop at Corinth when Clement's Epistle was written, or in Philippi when Polycarp's Epistle was written, p. 76. The Episcopal office in its original and post-apostolic institution was one of simple priority among other ministers, rather than a superior order in the Church, p. 81.

The Christian ministry was not a priesthood, nor so regarded in the second century. A priesthood requires, not merely a non-prohibition, but a positive and express appointment of divine authority. Archbishop Whately is quoted with approbation:—"The authorities of the Christian Church have an undoubted right to allot to each functions such as they may judge most conducive to the great ends of the society. They have no reason to hold themselves bound to adhere always and everywhere to the original models left by the Apostles," p. 114.

He maintains the right of Christians to elect their own spiritual officers, as under the Apostles, and in the first six centuries. Like all Episcopalians, he is strongly opposed to the ruling-eldership; considers that there is no Scripture authority for it; admits that it may be very useful in preventing or restraining the growth of Hierarchical propensities; but it need not, and it must not, claim for itself Apostolic authority or antiquity. P. 57, "It is remarkable that men who maintain that the Church has authority to form a polity for itself, should be anxious to find Scripture authority

for it. This is due to a latent and irrepressible conviction that there is Church polity laid down in the Bible ; and that it is not prelatic." Congregationalists are practically approaching us. They are not now called "Independents," the spheres of their unions and councils are enlarging ; their Missionary Societies and Theological Seminaries are binding their congregations more closely together. Divisions among Methodists have hitherto been on Presbyterian lines, in the direction of fuller popular representation. Although only recently directing attention to Church polity, yet they are under the guidance of circumstances, tending towards Presbyterianism, which they seem to have almost reached.

IMPORTANCE OF STUDYING CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

1. Because it reveals the constitution of the Church, its privileges, and the means of its edification and extension. 2. Because divisions in the Church are generally in reference to polity. 3. Because much importance is attached to it in Scripture. The Lord chose and trained Apostles ; and being exalted, gave apostles, prophets, evangelists, and pastors and teachers ; and told the disciples to pray to Him to send forth labourers. The relative duties of members and officers are clearly indicated and enforced. 4. Because Scripture polity is related to and conservative of sound doctrine. Prelacy had its origin in the doctrine of Apostolic Succession and Sacramental Grace. Apart from Prelacy, Popery could not have arisen ; and to Popery, Prelacy has an irrepressible tendency to return. 5. According to Rev. Mr. Mossman, the present divided and distracted state of the Church of Christ, and the paralysis of its missionary powers for 1500 years, are due to departure from Apostolic polity.

ADEQUATE INFORMATION IN SCRIPTURE IN REFERENCE TO APOSTOLIC POLITY.—The proof that the Apostles did institute or sanction Church Polity must reveal the nature of the polity. Many complain that there is no system of polity clearly laid down; but the same may be said of doctrine, which is presented in a fragmentary and concrete manner, as occasion required. Besides, the Apostles did not institute a brand-new system of government; they merely sanctioned government which had existed 1850 years. The Apostles based both their doctrinal teaching and their polity on a previous revelation. This, so far as polity is concerned, may be safely done, if we omit all things necessarily connected with Levitical sacrifices and ritual, and confine our attention to fundamental principles of government, which have been the same under all dispensations. If this fact be held fast, we shall find all the information needed or reasonably expected in reference to New Testament Church polity. The New Testament Church was not erected till the day of Pentecost. The term "Church" is only twice used in the Gospels, Matt. xvi: 18; xviii: 17, both being prospective, but very frequently afterwards: Acts ii: 47; v: 11; viii: 1, 3; ix: 31; xi: 22; xii: 1-5. The new organization was substantially the same as the old. The Kingly, Priestly, and Prophetic offices were henceforth to be filled by Christ alone. But the government of the people by Elders was wholly independent of temporary Levitical institutions, and survived them all. The first Church organized was that of Jerusalem, and it was on the ancient model: Acts xi: 30; xv: 2, 4, 6, 22; xvi: 4. It was the same in Gentile Churches: Acts xiv: 23; xx: 17; I Tim. v: 17; Titus i: 5; James v: 14. We have here the plan and foundation on which the New Testament Church was erected.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE IN STUDYING THE SUBJECT.—The meaning of "Church" and of the terms that denote church officers must be very carefully ascertained. As Scripture names of officers continue while their meaning is changed, it is necessary, in any particular case or age, to ascertain what were their qualifications, their powers, and their spheres of labour, as these names do not explain themselves. When "Bishop" occurs, we must ask: Is he a Bishop of one congregation or of a number of congregations and their pastors? If the latter, Is he merely Diocesan? or, Is he a Prelate who succeeds to Apostolic powers needed to render Orders and Sacraments valid? When an Elder is named, the question is, Whether is he a Ruling-elder or a Minister of the Gospel? When "Deacon" occurs, Is he a domestic, a church officer, who has the care of the poor, or a minister of the gospel, or an apostle? If many Presbyters were associated in one city, as in Rome, Corinth, or Ephesus, this does not warrant the inference that their chairman—if they had one—was a diocesan. The correct meaning of Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon in this discussion is to be found in the Apostolic Church, not in the Church in the fourth or the nineteenth century.

PROOF—GENERAL AND SPECIFIC—THAT A FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS INSTITUTED OR SANCTIONED BY THE APOSTLES.—I. General Proof: (a) As a form of government was appointed in the Jewish Church, we are warranted to infer that a form would be appointed in the New Testament Church, and that it would be the same as the former, so far as it was spiritual and not connected with the Sacrificial system. (b) The Church, as a visible society, could not be erected or held together without officers, rules, and institutions of some

kind. The Apostolical organization must be authoritative. (c) Terms are used to designate the Church which indicate that it had an organic form at the beginning, *e.g.*, Temple of which Christ is the builder, the foundation, and the chief corner-stone: Matt. xvi: 18; Eph. ii: 22; I Cor. iii: 9, 10; I Peter ii: 4, 5.

II. Specific Proof is furnished by a statement of the officers appointed by the Apostles, everywhere, of their qualifications, powers and duties, with the corresponding duties of private Christians. This proof is most ample and convincing. Before considering it, we shall advert to

DEFINITIONS OF THE CHURCH.

I. The Catholic or Universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the Head thereof, and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

II. The Visible Church, which is also Catholic or Universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation, as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation. Conf. of Faith, ch. xxv.

ROMISH DEFINITION.—The congregation of all the faithful, professing the same faith, partaking in the sacraments, governed by lawful pastors, under one visible head, the Vicar of Christ.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND DEFINITION.—The Visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in

which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be administered according to Christ's ordinance in all things which of necessity are requisite to the same.

ANGLICANS understand by the Church an external society professing the true faith, united in the communion of the same sacraments, and in subjection to Bishops canonically ordained.*

In the Church of England definition, the means of grace are referred to. In the Romish and Anglican, government and means of grace are referred to.

The difference between these two consists in this, that the Anglican omits the reference to the Pope, and substitutes Bishops for lawful pastors, being thus the more prelatie of the two. In the Church of England definition, Evangelicals understand no more than our Confession teaches, while Anglicans recognize no due ministration of sacraments except by bishops and priests. In this they are sustained by the Ordinal:—"It is evident to all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons." In the Ordinal of 1549 the lessons read in connection with the ordination of a priest and of a bishop are the same; but in the Ordinal of 1642, Acts xx: 17-35; I Tim. iii: 1-16; Matt. xxviii: 18-20; John xx: 19-23; are read only in connection with the ordination of a bishop or archbishop. Thus the form of Church government is virtually included in the Church of England definition; and thus the Anglicans are able to maintain their ground against the Evangelicals.

*The Confession alone defines the Church in its highest aspect, as invisible. Also, into its definition of the Church visible, the nature of Church government and the means of grace do not enter.

III. Church sometimes denotes many congregations under one Presbytery. (Form of Church Government.)

IV. Church is used to denote professed believers in Christ united in one congregation.

The first definition clearly presents the essential and fundamental idea of the Church. Thus, Church is used as a collective term to denote all who are, or who shall be, saved. This is necessarily the highest sense, to which all other meanings must be subordinate. This is the only Church of which unity, holiness, indefectibility, and also universality and perpetuity, can be properly predicated. Some Protestants apply these attributes or notes to the visible Church. They say that as true Christians, regenerated persons, although not perfectly holy, are said to be part of the invisible Church, so the visible Church may be called holy, although there are many in it who are not regenerated persons. But this is not a proper comparison, as the defect in the one case is in the present imperfect state of true religion, while in the other the defect is in the want of true religion altogether. Practically, however, in opposing Romanism it is better not to discuss the "notes" or marks of the Church, but to take your stand on some doctrine, as justification by faith alone, sacramental grace, or Church polity. The visible Church is referred to in Acts ii : 47 ; vii : 38 ; I Cor. xii : 28 ; John xv : 1-8. The Church invisible and visible, cannot be said to constitute two Churches, but one Church in two aspects. The term invisible was used because Romanists insisted that Church denotes only one visible organization ; because it is only one small fraction of the Church that exists on earth at one time ; because we cannot always distinguish those who belong to it from

those who only profess to do so. The same distinction is made in the Old Testament. Every Christian naturally makes this distinction. The visible Church is also said to be Catholic. Christian denominations are united outwardly in professing faith in Christ and obedience to Him; and inwardly, because they all include members of the Church invisible, which is one body in which the Spirit dwells. This unity should manifest itself to the world by mutual recognition, co-operation, and confederation of Christian denominations, as far as practicable. Visible unity should be kept in view and aimed at.

CONGREGATIONALISTS deny that "Church" is ever used in this sense. They say that it denotes "the whole body of the faithful," "the entire spiritual Israel of God," or "a society of believers in any place." Hence they insist on regeneration and saving faith as indispensable qualifications for membership, instead of a credible profession and corresponding life. But the impossibility of ascertaining who are regenerated, the fact that mere professors do join all Churches, and that Christ recognizes this fact, should be taken into account. This test must exclude infants; hence many of them are opposed to the baptism of infants; while others say that the Sacraments are mere forms. The third meaning is denied by Congregationalists, who insist that ecclesia is used to denote only one congregation, and in the Classics one assembly. But we must be guided by Scripture use. Proof: Acts ix: 31. The Church in Jerusalem, under Apostles and Elders, sent Peter and John to Samaria, viii: 14; and Barnabas to Antioch, xi: 22; and decided an appeal from Antioch, xv. The Church in Jerusalem must have contained many congregations, i.-vi. The members spoke different languages,

enjoyed the labours of the Apostles and Prophets for many years. The Church personified, xi : 22, must represent one body. The case of the Church at Ephesus is as good an example. (See Rev. ii : 1 ; Acts xx : 28) In Acts xix : 8-10, it is said that Paul preached two years and three months ; and in xx : 31, that he preached three years. He must, therefore, have itinerated nine months, xix : 26. There is no doubt that he formed many congregations in the Province of Asia. Had there been only one he would not have required to send for the Elders ; he could as easily and speedily have visited them as they could visit him. Peter calls the Churches in Asia Minor "the flock of God."

The fourth meaning is not disputed.

V. Church sometimes denotes church officers, in their collective capacity. In the Old Testament the Elders represented the congregation, which is by the LXX rendered ecclesia or synagogue, as in Ex. iii : 13-16. In xii. the gerousian in v. 21, is equivalent to pasan synagogen in v. 3 ; see also Ex. xix : 7, 8. Hence Elders are called the Church because they represented it. In Matt. xviii : 17, the Lord plainly refers either to Elders in the Old Testament Church or to Elders in the New Testament.

OFFICERS.

To understand the kind of Church government appointed by the Apostles, we must ascertain who were the officers appointed by them. Authoritative information on this point can be obtained only from Scripture. Afterwards, we may consider the light shed on the subject by Church literature during the first two centuries, at least.

THE OFFICERS IN THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH CONSTITUTE TWO CLASSES—1. The ordinary and permanent. 2. The extraordinary and temporary. The former may be distinguished from the latter by two things. They were everywhere appointed; and their qualifications, powers, and spheres of labour are stated, or were well known, as in the case of the Old Testament Elders, who, retaining their name and functions, were transferred to the Christian Church, at its beginning, among the Jews. These tests are indispensable. Judged thus, and according to the chronological sequence of their appointment, the Ordinary and Permanent are Elders, Deacons and Ministers.

I. ELDERS.

1ST. HISTORICAL AND INCIDENTAL PROOF.—They are first mentioned in the New Testament in Acts xi: 30, and then only incidentally, showing that their office was an existing institution, and had not to be created. There is no record of their appointment in Palestine. The office had its origin far back in the nation's history, and it was not affected by change of Dispensations. Church discipline was under the Old Dispensation sometimes exercised by spiritual officers, II. Chron. xix: 8-11. The office of Ruling-elder was not connected with the Sacrificial system and abolished with it. It was not connected with anything temporary. The Scriptures clearly teach that there were officers in the Church whose only duty was to govern. Statements in our Subordinate Standards in reference to this office:—Confession of Faith, xxxi: 2, a Synod is composed of "Ministers, with other fit persons upon delegation from their churches." Form of Church Government, "As there were in the Jewish Church, Elders of the people

joined with the Priests and Levites in the government of the Church, so Christ, who hath instituted government and governors ecclesiastical in the Church, hath furnished some in His Church, beside the ministers of the Word, with gifts for government and with commission to execute the same when called thereunto, who are to join with the ministers in the government of the Church, which officers Reformed Churches commonly call Elders." Under Classical Assemblies, "A Presbytery consisteth of ministers of the Word, and such other public officers as are agreeable to and warranted by the Word of God to be Church governors, to join with the ministers in the government of the Church." Synodical Assemblies "are composed of pastors and teachers and other Church governors." "Ministers and other Church governors of each congregation make arrangement for the Communion." "The office of the Elder (*i.e.* the pastor) is to pray for the sick." These, so far as I know, are all the references to Elders in our Subordinate Standards. They all represent them as Church governors or rulers, and nothing more.

As the office existed in the Old Testament Church, and was continued in the New Testament Church, we must find all needed information in reference to it in the Old Testament, and also in incidental notices of it in the New Testament.

The term Elder, as the name of an office-bearer, occurs very frequently in Scripture, from beginning to end, during several dispensations of religion. It first occurs in Gen. xxiv : 2, "Abraham said unto his servant, the elder of his house, that ruled over all that he had." Revised Version, in L : 7, we read of "all the servants of Pharaoh, the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt." In the beginning of

Exodus we read very frequently of the elders who ruled the Israelites before the commencement of the Mosaic Dispensation. The office is frequently referred to after the giving of the law; and in the historical and prophetic books, including those referring to the Babylonian Captivity, Jer. xxix: 1 Ezek. viii: 11; xx: 1-3. We read also of elders in the Gospels, Epistles, and Revelation. These numerous references to elders are sufficient to show that they were rulers in the Church of God from the time of Abraham to the termination of the Apostolic age; and hence as they neither originated with the Levitical system, nor were suspended with it at Babylon, nor were terminated with it, they were evidently not a part of it, we are surely warranted to assume that their powers and duties were the same in all Dispensations, unless we are expressly informed that they were changed, or that additions were made to them. We must now ascertain what were their powers. This can be done only by referring to the passages which indicate their relation to the people, and also the duties which they discharged, their qualifications being never stated. It is useless to quote passages in which the name is merely repeated without indicating the functions pertaining to it. It is only by a careful, and, if need be, an exhaustive induction of examples that the nature of the office can be ascertained.

Elder or Presbyter has in the Old Testament very extensive signification, as extensive as "officer" or "ruler," Num. xi: 16; II Kings x: 1. In Num. xxii: 4, 7, it refers to the princes of Moab and of Midian; and in Josh. ix: 11, it refers to those of the Gibeonites. We read of the "Elders of the priests," in Isaiah xxxvii: 2; II Kings xix: 2; and in Jer. xix: 1, they are distinguished from the "Elders of the people." Elders

of tribes are spoken of in Deut. xxxi : 28 ; II Chron. v 2. (a) There is in the Old Testament one distinguishing characteristic of all Elders, they were rulers, not teachers. There is no passage in the Old Testament in which they are said to teach. Had they been teachers, they would surely have been employed in the emergency referred to in II Chron. xvii : 7-9. All the passages already quoted—and they might be multiplied indefinitely—show that in their various spheres, whether they were princes, tribal heads, or local magistrates, they were merely rulers. (b) The Old Testament Elders were representatives of the people Ex. iii : 14 16, 18 ; iv : 29-31 ; xii : 3, 21 ; xix : 7, 8 ; Deut. v : 22, 23 ; xxxi : 28-30. In Lev. iv : 13-15, we learn that the Elders represented the people in a solemn religious service.

There are numerous references to Jewish Elders as representatives and rulers of the people, in the New Testament, and in the time of our Lord and His Apostles. They are called "Elders of the people," Matt. xxi : 23 ; xxvi : 3 ; and "Elders of the Jews," Luke vii : 3 ; and they are continually joined with the Chief Priests in all the public acts with reference to the arrest, trial, condemnation and crucifixion of our Lord, Matt. xvi : 21 ; xxvi : 47, 59 ; xxvii : 1, 3, 12 ; xxviii : 12. Peter and John were arraigned before the Elders of Israel, Acts iv : 8, 23 ; Stephen was condemned by them, vi : 12 ; Paul was persecuted by them, xxiii : 14 ; and by them accused before the Roman Governor, xxiv : 1 ; xxv : 15.

Now, as some of the Old Testament Elders were heads of tribes, and some were both local magistrates and spiritual rulers, like 77 Elders of the village of Succoth, we cannot distinguish them from one another

by the term "Elder," but only by references to their functions and spheres of duty. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the same discrimination must be required in reference to the term Elder when transferred to the New Testament. It is contrary to uniform Scripture usage to say that Elder must always have precisely the same meaning. In what hopeless confusion would one be involved were he to treat Diakonos in this manner. It would be as unreasonable as Congregationalists are in founding their whole Church Polity on one word, "Ecclesia," which has been proved to have several meanings. While referring to Jewish Church rulers, I desire to quote the words of Prof. J. A. Alexander: "The idea of a separate organization and a distinct class of officers appears to have arisen after the destruction of Jerusalem, and could not, therefore, be a model of the Christian Church, which had its pattern not in later Jewish institutions, but in the permanent essential part of the old theocracy, including its primeval patriarchal eldership, one primarily founded upon natural relations or the family government, and thence transferred not only to the Jewish, but to the Christian Church organization. Of such rulers there was always a plurality in every neighbourhood, but not a bench or council of elective officers, uniform in number, as in the later synagogues, when the dispersion of the people had destroyed the ancient constitution and the present synagogue arrangement had been substituted for it. But as this arrangement is without divine authority, nothing is gained, but something lost, by tracing the New Testament polity to this source, instead of tracing it further back to the Presbyterian forms of the theocracy itself."

It is through representative Elders the people

under the gospel exercise the power of self-government so far as it is inherent in the Church. According to our Confession of Faith and accompanying documents, the first Elders in the Church of Christ were the same as the Elders of the Jews, who exercised government and discipline in the Old Testament Church. This is sustained by the following references : They received contributions, Acts xi : 30 ; were members of the Council at Jerusalem, xv. They were members of the Presbytery of Jerusalem, xxi : 18 ; their previous standing in congregations formed of converted Jews was recognized, without re-election ; they were appointed in all Gentile congregations generally as soon as they were formed, xiv. : 23. In none of these references are they represented as preaching the gospel or teaching. In fact, the name Presbyter or Elder was not associated with "labouring in the word and doctrine" till near the close of the Apostolic age, and even then in only two passages in the New Testament. In one of those (I Tim. v : 17), teaching Elders are expressly distinguished from the ruling Elders, of whom alone we read in all the earlier portions of Scripture. The other passage is Titus i : 5-9. But this passage, in connection with I. Tim. iii. : 1-7, plainly refers to the institution of a new office. Hence it is authoritatively ordered to be appointed, and the qualifications for it and the duties that belong to it are distinctly and emphatically stated, as if they were not previously known. In fact, according to Titus i : 5, it was an office intended "to set in order the things that are wanting," or to complete the organization of the Church. This is confirmed by II Tim. ii : 2, 24. These persons were entitled to the designation of Elders or

Presbyters so far as they were Church rulers. But their distinctive functions were those which in ancient times, especially in the Kingdom of Israel, had been performed by prophets and sons of prophets, and in our Lord's time by scribes, lawyers and doctors of the law, and more recently still by the ministry of gifts. Our Lord, when using a Jewish official name to designate preachers of the gospel, does not call them Elders, which His hearers could not have understood to mean preachers, but He speaks of them (Matt. xiii : 52) as "wise scribes instructed unto the Kingdom of Heaven," and He says (xxiii : 34) that "He would send prophets and wise men and scribes." While there were ruling Elders from the very beginning of the Gospel Church, there were then evidently no stated ministers of the Word, nor while the ministry of gifts, including Apostles, prophets, evangelists, and very many occasionally inspired persons in every congregation prevailed, and was in the zenith of its glory. I Cor. i : 4-7 ; xii : 7-11. In these circumstances there was special need of a body of influential ruling Elders, such as had been amply provided to preserve the very existence of the Church as a religious society, and to prevent divisions and anarchy. It is clear that the ministry of gifts was incompatible with a stated ministry and could not be permanent (I Thess. v : 20), and that the former was gradually superseded by the latter, the two overlapping one another for a considerable time at the transition period, under the authority and direction of the Apostles, while they completed the organization of the Church.

It is worthy of notice that calling both teaching and ruling officers "Elders" does not occasion the slightest perplexity, as church rulers are called Elders, while

preachers are so designated in only two passages. Their proper name is "ministers"—*diakonoi*—a name by which church rulers are never designated. Paul calls himself and his fellow-labourers "ministers" of the New Testament" (I Cor. iii : 5 ; II Cor. iii : 6). He calls them "ministers of God" (vi : 1, 4). False teachers are called "ministers of Satan," while Paul was "a minister of Christ" (xi : 13, 15, 23). Paul was made a minister that he should preach among the Gentiles (Eph. iii : 7, 8). "Tychicus was a faithful minister in the Lord" (vi : 21). Epaphras was "a faithful minister of Christ" (Col. i : 7). Paul himself was made "a minister of the gospel" (23). Archippus had received "a ministry" (iv : 17). Timothy was "a good minister of Jesus Christ" (I Tim. iv : 6). Thus the New Testament designation of church officers is "ministers and elders."

Now, as the Apostles appointed several Elders in every congregation, and as the office of Elder had a historical basis extending farther back than the origin of Israel as a nation, and as it came into the New Testament Church with Jewish converts who were ruling-elders, as a matter of course and without remark, much less direct information and proof in reference to the office are needed than would be required in the creation of a new office like that of deacon (Acts vi ; I Tim. iii : 8-13), or of ministers of the gospel.

It is well to notice that teachers and rulers are frequently distinguished, either expressly or tacitly, as belonging to different classes. Thus, in I Peter iv : 11, it is said : "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God ; if any man minister, as of the ability which God giveth." *Diakonei*, as distinguished from *Lalei*, evidently denotes "*quævis ministeria in Ecclesia ab docendi officio distincta.*" In Eph. iv : 11, we have *Poimenes* and *Didaskalous* stated separately,

but not so completely separated as Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists. *Poimenes* means rulers, as will be proved presently. Rulers is evidently the generic or class term—equal to Presbyters—and the teachers or preachers of the gospel are a species of rulers. Calling them a species does not make them inferior to rulers, any more than calling man a species of animal makes him inferior to other animals. In fact, the differentia which is “rational,” raises him far above all other animals and makes him akin to angels. Thus, if a minister is a teaching or preaching ruler, he is raised above all other church rulers by the function of preaching. He has all that other rulers have and “labouring in the Word and doctrine” in addition. The differentia here is what Paul considered his greatest privilege and honour, even as an Apostle. (See Eph. iii : 8 ; I Tim. i : 12 ; Gal. i : 15, 16 ; I Cor. i : 17.) As ministers of the gospel are a species of rulers, when Paul addresses the bishops or rulers at Philippi he no doubt included both ministers and ruling-elders under the same class name—bishops, presbyters, and rulers being synonymous. When Peter addresses the Elders or Presbyters of Asia Minor, he calls himself a Presbyter ; thus, under the generic term, he addresses all the preachers and rulers of the Church, stating the manner in which they should act as rulers, while he says nothing about preaching. They had hitherto known him merely as a missionary and a witness of the sufferings of Christ. The Apostle John also (Epistles ii. and iii.) calls himself a presbyter or ruler, as in his old age he had become incapacitated for missionary work, and could exercise only the ruling function connected with his Apostolic office. These distinctions may help to make clearer the proof now to be presented.

2ND. PRECEPTIVE PROOF, WHICH IS LARGELY EXEGETIC.—In Rom. xii : 6-8, teachers and rulers are spoken of as different officers. An illustration is borrowed from the human body to show that each officer has his specific function. Teachers and rulers are placed in different classes. The generic terms are Propheteian and Diakonian. These have not the article, while all the others have it and are thus distinguished as species. Besides, the construction is changed between the two classes, which makes the distinction more clear. In this classification we have three permanent officers, the teacher, the ruler and the giver or distributor, who correspond to minister of the gospel, ruling-elder, and deacon, the teacher being placed in one category and the ruler and deacon in another. The others belonged to the temporary ministry of gifts, as we know that there were prophets, and Barnabas (Acts iv : 36) is called a "son of exhortation," and he that sheweth mercy may represent one who specially cared for the sick. These naturally fall under the same classification with the others, all kinds of teachers being placed in one class, and all who were not teachers being placed in the other. It is objected that the reference to officers terminates with "on exhortation," and that the three following are classed with private persons. The grounds on which the objection rests are the following:—(1) That the verb *metadidomi* cannot refer to the deacon, as it means giving what is one's own ; whereas, giving out of a common fund would require *diadidomi*. But this is not sustained by use. *Metadidomi*, in Luke iii : 11, and in Eph. iv : 28, means to give what is one's own ; but in Rom. i : 11 and in I Thess. ii : 8, it means giving what is not one's own. *Diadidomi* denotes giving one's own in John vi : 11 ;

Luke xi : 22 ; xviii : 22 ; Rev. xvii : 13 ; in Acts iv : 35 it is doubtful. These are all the cases in which the verbs occur in the New Testament. Thus the distinction between the two verbs is not between giving one's own and what belongs to another, but between giving and distributing. Besides, where private giving is referred to, among social virtues, in v : 13, *koinonountes* is used. (2) The other objection is that were *proistamenos* a church officer, or, as is unwarrantably assumed, a pastor or bishop, he would be placed too low in the list. But this is entirely obviated if he is a ruling-elder, to which he manifestly belongs. In I Tim. v : 17, *proistos*, a part of the same verb, is used to denote one who only rules. Others say that the word denotes merely a president ; but there is no such officer ; besides, he could not be said to preside with diligence. In I Thess. v : 12, the same word denotes an active ruler. The word properly denotes a ruler, hence the Greek Fathers long after used *proistos*, a participle of the same verb, and *proistamenos*, to denote a diocesan, which Latin writers rendered "*præpositus* or *præfectus*." If *proistamenos* is a ruling-elder, he is in his proper place, and all is clear. In I Cor. xii : 28, it is said that God hath set in the Church "teachers and governments." These are two offices permanently needed, although miraculous gifts were temporary. Their functions are distinct, like the functions of the different members of the human body here used in illustration. They must, therefore, in some cases, be held by different individuals. Hence, it is only in the case of ruling-elders they can be separated, and they were the first permanent officers, and the great majority of officers in the Church. In I Tim. v : 17, there are two classes of officers: one that rules and also "labours in the word and doctrine," and

another that only rules. Futile attempts are made to obscure or pervert this plain statement. Some say that *malista* should be connected with *kopiontes*, indicating those who specially "labour in the word and doctrine." But the arrangement of the words forbids this; others that *kopiontes* means to labour hard. But this is not sustained by usage. Paul uses *kopin* in I Cor. iii: 8; and *kopiontes* in I Thess. v: 12 to denote ordinary, official work. (See also Rev. ii: 3; Matt. vi: 28; Acts xx: 35.) When excessive labour is meant, another word is added: Rom xvi: 6, 12; I Thess ii: 9; II Thess iii: 8; Matt. xi: 28. The Authorized Version and Revised Version render it correctly. Bishop Ellicott admits the correct translation, but seeks to enfeeble it by referring to Neander's remark that "some might have the gift of teaching more eminently than others." This is not fair, as the Apostle speaks here not of gifts but of officers; besides, this ignores the whole historical proof of the eldership in the Old Testament and in the New Testament. A number of church officers, rulers, were appointed in every congregation; but so many ministers of the Word could not be required, nor supported. Gal. vi: 6; II Cor. xi: 7-9; I Cor. ix: 13, 14.

Another thing that distinguishes ministers of the gospel from ruling-elders, is that the former are said to be called or sent by Christ to preach the gospel, while the latter are not. This is the belief of nearly all denominations of Christians. The Apostles and others were called by Christ: Luke vi: 13; Acts xxvi: 16; xiii: 2; Matt. ix: 37, 38; II Cor. v: 20; I Tim. iv: 14; i: 18. This call assures one of all needed grace and support, and a suitable sphere of labour, at home or abroad. It is effectual. To enter on the ministry without it is presumption. It is a most dangerous thing, in

support of any theory, to minimize this call, to think lightly of it, or to neglect it. This call is sufficient to make the ministry of the Word an office different from and superior to the eldership. Besides, sinners may be converted and built up in faith and knowledge without government; but this is impossible without the preaching of the gospel. Ruling-elders must, however, have a popular call. According to our Standards, "Christ hath furnished some in the Church, beside the ministers of the Word, with gifts for government, and with commission to exercise the same when called thereunto."

These are cumulative and sufficient proofs that Elders, in virtue of their office, were rulers, not teachers.

OBJECTIONS TO THIS STATEMENT.

I. That all the Elders at Ephesus are called Bishops (Acts xx. : 17-28) and are exhorted to feed, *i.e.*, to teach the Church of God. But, as the terms "Elders" and "Bishops" are in the New Testament synonymous and convertible, either name could properly be given them. This objection amounts to nothing. Besides, "poimainein," here rendered to feed, never means to teach, but to rule. (See Rev. ii : 27; xix : 15.) Jer. iii : 15, should be rendered: "I will give you rulers after mine own heart, and they shall rule you with knowledge and discretion." xxiii : 4-6; Ezek. xxxiv : 23-24; Ps. lxxviii : 70-72; II Sam. v : 2-3; Ps. lxxx : 1-2; Jer. xxiii : 1-5; I Chron. xi : 2; xvii : 7; Ps. ii : 9; xlviii : 14. Moreover, the feeding in Acts xx is plainly shown to be exercising government and discipline; nothing else is referred to.

Hence, this does not touch the point at issue, as it is admitted that all ministers and elders were rulers. In I Peter v: 2 feeding is explained. Under Pastors, in the Form of Church Government, a person is said "to feed by preaching the Word." The texts quoted in support of this are irrelevant. Classical usage sustains the meaning now given Agamemnon in Il., B. II: 1243, is called "Shepherd of the People," and the same title is given to Dryas, B. I: 1263.

II. OBJECTION.—According to Titus i: 5-11, and I Tim. iii: 1-7, all Elders must be apt to teach. But surely Paul does not contradict himself in v: 17. A man could not be worthy of double honour for doing only the least important half of his duty. It is said that a majority of these Elders necessarily waived their right to preach, that a regularly qualified ministry might be appointed, and that the Church did not require them to preach. But, in this matter, right and duty are inseparably connected. If a man has an official right to preach, it must be because he is called by Christ to do so, and has the needful qualifications and is ordained by the Presbytery to preach, and in general, is called by a congregation. In such a case he cannot neglect his official duty and engage in a secular occupation, nor can the Church deprive him of his right. If the Church can, as a matter of convenience, deprive a man of his higher function of preaching—and this it does when an Elder is appointed on the understanding that he is not to addict himself to the ministry of the Word—it can more easily deprive him of his inferior function of ruling and give it to a diocesan. This is all that Anglicans wish, and all that Romanists need.

The Apostles did not change their Church polity,

but gradually instituted it. They continued the previously existing ruling eldership, in due time instituted the office of Deacon, and, when their own ministry and that of spiritual gifts were gradually terminating, they instituted the ministry of the Word.

It is said that Elders are officially entitled to preach because they are ordained. But their ordination is merely a formal and Scriptural attestation that they have "gifts for government," and that they are duly called by the congregation to exercise these gifts ; and an installation of them into office. Thus they are not ordained "to labour in the word and doctrine."

CONSEQUENCES OF HOLDING THE ERROR THAT MINISTERS
OF THE GOSPEL AND RULING ELDERS, ORIGINALLY
AND BY APOSTOLIC APPOINTMENT, HAD THE
SAME OFFICE AND POWERS.

(a) The office of Elder, instead of being exalted, would be abolished—the differentia between them and ministers being denied.

(b) The Session would be converted into a Presbytery, and could perpetuate itself, as the Elders might be pleased to use their latent powers, and induct one of themselves into the pastorate—ordination to the ministry, in the case supposed, not being necessary.

(c) Then Prelatists could properly say that Presbyterians are, after all, under clerical government, as all their spiritual officers are ministers or clergymen.

(d) Many now decline the office of Elder, because, as they say, they are not qualified to hold prayer-meetings, to preach and exhort ; and thus the Church is deprived of many valuable rulers, and is compelled to select persons on account of qualities not indispensable in rulers, and who are otherwise objectionable.

(e) A majority of spiritual office-bearers are thus said to have an official right to "labour in the word," who are not supposed to be qualified, and are called neither by the Church nor by Christ Himself to do so.

(f) The notion contended for by some, that making an official distinction between ministers and ruling-elders is the germ of Prelacy, as it introduced a gradation of officers, is absurd. This would be equally opposed to the Diaconate. The imaginary germ of Prelacy is harmless, as it did not grow, as is well known, in the Apostolic age, when the polity of the Church was instituted and completed, and so far as Scriptural authority is concerned, was fixed for ever.

The tendency of the error here opposed is much more dangerous than many Presbyterians seem to be aware of. It not only abolishes the office of Ruling-elder, rightly so called, but it is opposed to a stated and duly qualified ministry of the Word. If the great majority of spiritual officers are Ruling-elders, if they are confessedly not called by Christ to "labour in the word and doctrine," and if they are officially equal to ministers, the ministry must, in such a case, lack its distinguishing characteristic.

(g) The call of Christ only can entitle a man to enter into the ministry. The duty of the Presbytery in the matter is mainly to ascertain whether he is truly called—ascertaining this from a knowledge of his character, qualifications, religious experience, and profession—and to authenticate said call by solemnly, and in a Scriptural manner, ordaining him. If a man has not this call, the laying the hands of a hundred Presbyteries on his head will not make him a minister of Christ. And yet, forsooth, we are asked to believe that Ruling-elders who lack this are officially equal to ministers of the gospel.

If the great majority of church officers appointed by the Apostles were merely rulers, and if there was a plurality of them in every congregation, this is irrefragable proof—not to mention Acts xx. and I Peter v.—that government is to be exercised by officers, and not by the people in their collective capacity, nor by those who are called a superior order—*i. e.*, diocesans—who are never mentioned in Scripture. Hence it is easy to see how deeply interested Congregationalists and Episcopalians are in seeking to disprove the divine appointment of the ruling-eldership, and how earnestly Presbyterians should contend for and maintain it.

In discussing the theory of the eldership, several questions often put should be considered :

1. Are Ruling-elders entitled to take part in ordaining church officers? In the Westminster Assembly's Form of Church Government, it is said, three times, that " Every minister is to be ordained by imposition of hands, and prayer, with fasting, by the preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong." And it is also said that he " is to be examined and approved by the preaching presbyters by whom he is to be ordained." It is also said " that the power of ordering the whole work of ordination is in the whole Presbytery "—*i. e.*, whether he is to be ordained, and where and when the ordination is to take place, and who are to conduct the services. There is Scripture warrant for ordination by preaching officers. The Apostles (Acts vi : 6) ordained the deacons; certain prophets and teachers (xiii : 1-3) ordained Paul and Barnabas; Paul and Barnabas (xiv : 23) ordained presbyters in many congregations; Timothy and Titus, no doubt assisted by the other preachers that were in the same sphere, ordained very many presbyters. These are all the passages in which we are told who were the

persons that ordained. They were all preaching officers. In one case, that of Timothy (I Tim. iv: 14), we are told that ordination was by the Presbytery. This is not sufficient—as we are not told who were the persons ordaining or even constituting said Presbytery—to set aside all the other cases, which were very numerous, especially as we may well suppose that Paul and his associated missionaries constituted the Presbytery on this occasion. This passage, however, is valuable proof that the ordination was by several individuals, and that they were presbyters

It is reasonable to suppose that ordination should be, as it always has been, performed by the highest officers in the Church. How unsuitable would it be were mere rulers to ordain ministers of the gospel, and thus introduce them into an office to which the ordainers do not belong.

2. Are Ruling-elders competent to preside in Church courts? The answer to the preceding question disposes of this. The stated or *pro tem.* Moderator of the Presbytery must preside at ordinations. Hence if a Ruling elder is not competent to ordain, he cannot be a Moderator of Presbytery. It is a mistake to suppose that ministers sit in Presbytery merely as rulers, with whom they are associated. They sit also as ministers, having, and, if need be, exercising the powers which belong to the ministry. That a Ruling-elder should represent the Presbytery in licensing, ordaining, censuring, suspending or deposing ministers of the gospel would be absurd and unscriptural. Without an explicit divine injunction to this effect, no minister of the gospel would submit to it, and no congregation having the smallest respect for the ministry would tolerate it.

3. Should Ruling-elders be appointed for life? Difference of opinion on this point has long existed in the Church. In the first Book of Discipline, A.D. 1560 (x: 3), it is said: "The election of Elders and Deacons ought to be made every year once, which we judge to be most convenient on the first day of August; lest of long continuance of such officers, men presume on the liberties of the Church: it hurteth not that one be received more years than one, so that he be appointed yearly by common and free election." In the second Book of Discipline, A.D. 1690 (vi: 2), it is said: "Elders anis lawfully callit to the office, and having gifts of God meit to exercise the same, may not leive it again." The subject has been frequently brought before the judicatories of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. The General Assembly has refused to sanction the election of Elders for a term of years, as contrary to the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, and as inexpedient. But, not to speak of just occasion of deposition from office, it is agreed that when an Elder has become incapable of performing his duties, or unacceptable in his official character to a majority of the congregation, he may cease to be an acting elder. Many think that as Elders are representatives of the people, the people should have an opportunity within a limited period to elect them, as they elect members of Parliament; but the analogy must not be pressed, as Parliament enacts laws that bind their constituents; whereas Elders have no legislative authority whatever, all they can do being merely to enforce the laws laid down by the Head of the Church, not even making terms of communion or instituting rites which He has not appointed. The General Assembly of the United States and our General Assembly are too con-

servative to discuss this matter in thesi ; so that petitions or overtures with a view to change will not be entertained. Should complaints in reference to the deportment and government of Elders become increasingly numerous and clamant, and should the methods of relief now provided prove inadequate or impracticable, there is no doubt that a limited term of service will become necessary. But this may be obviated, or at least deferred, by greater care in the election of Elders, and by greater circumspection and Christian courtesy on their part.

4. A question very frequently asked by Elders-elect is, How shall we ascertain what qualifications we should possess and what duties we should discharge ? The history of the office, and its very name, show that an Elder should be a man of high Christian character, and of such influence in the Church and in the community as is generally to be found only in connection with age and experience, although these are occasionally to be found in young persons. If he is to be a censor of morals, his deportment must be exemplary. Again, he should have a good knowledge of the Word of God, and he should be sound and steadfast in the faith. He is not as an Elder bound to teach at all. But if he is qualified to do so and is inclined to it, his services may be of very great value to young persons under his oversight. He should be acquainted with all the families committed to his care, and evince earnest solicitude for their spiritual welfare. So far as government or discipline is concerned, he should learn from the study of Scripture the source of spiritual authority in Christ, and the nature of ecclesiastical power set forth in His Word.

The office of Ruling-elder is most honourable and

responsible. It is the oldest of all Church offices. Ruling-elders are the great majority of spiritual officers. Upon the faithful and efficient discharge of their duties largely depend the permanent good effects of Church ordinances, the purity of Christian communion, the peace and prosperity of the Church, and its missionary zeal and efforts for the conversion of the world to God, and for the glory and satisfaction of the Redeemer.

II. DEACONS.

Deacons were permanent church officers, as their qualifications are distinctly stated, and as they were appointed at Jerusalem (Acts vi.), at Ephesus (I Tim. iii: 8-13), at Philippi (i: 1), and probably at Corinth (I Cor. xii: 28). They were the Church's almoners. *Diakonos* does not occur in Acts vi., "in the daily *Diakonia*" and also "*Diakonein*" tables. The name, in its strict technical sense, occurs only in I Tim. iii. and in Philip i: 1. Some deny that deacons are referred to in Acts vi.; but a comparison of it with I Tim. iii will show that both passages refer to the same class of officers. There is no proof that they managed the Church's finances. Although tables may denote banking, yet "*Diakonein*" tables can only mean to serve tables or distribute alms. Some Prelatists maintain that deacons were spiritual officers, and were appointed to preach and baptize; and that Stephen and Philip both preached as deacons, and that the latter wrought miracles and baptized, and that the qualifications in I Tim. iii. are too high for almoners. But Stephen's defence (Acts vii.) could not be called preaching, and Philip (Acts xxi: 8) was an evangelist. Besides, the qualifications in Acts vi. are very high. Those in I Tim. iii are suited to the treasurer of a benevolent fund.

Moreover, as it was during the ministry of gifts, and as these men were full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, they could preach as evangelists. Bishop Ellicott gives up the case, but he thinks that preaching deacons are called (I Cor. xii : 28) *Antilepseis*. But this is mere surmise, without a shadow of proof. If Acts vi. and I Tim. iii. do not refer to the same officers, then we have in Acts the history of the appointment of officers for whom there is no name, and we have in Timothy the qualifications and duties of officers, of whose appointment there is no record, and who did not exist under the Old Dispensation.

Deaconesses, some suppose, were also appointed, Rom. xvi : 1 ; I Tim. iii : 11. But the last text is correctly rendered in the Authorized Version. Besides, the solitary text, Rom. xvi., is not sufficient proof on account of the various meanings of *Diakonos*. Besides denoting a deacon, it refers to a domestic servant, Matt. xx : 26. It refers to a minister of good or evil, Gal. ii : 17 ; II Cor. xi : 15 ; to a secular ruler, Rom. xiii : 4. Many have contended that deaconesses are referred to in I Tim. v : 9, 10. But this is not likely. Those here referred to were upwards of sixty years old, mothers or grandmothers. They are spoken of not as persons who are to labour for the Church, but who are to be supported by the Church. We know that deacons were first appointed to take care of poor widows ; and it would be strange to require these aged widows to act as deaconesses. In the Form of Church Government, in the Confession of Faith, deacons are said to be distinct officers in the Church, whose office is perpetual. To whose office it belongs not to preach the Word, or administer the sacraments, but to take special care in distributing to the necessities of the poor. Such an office

reveals the benevolence of the gospel and of the Church of Christ.

The office of Deacon was instituted by the Apostles and should be restored. But in order to this, the deacon's official duty should be confined to the poor, or to those who need material aid. Christ has shown that His Church should be a benefactress by incorporating this idea with its very constitution, and that the Church is to care for the bodies of men as well as for their souls. There is still need for such an office, as the Church is not doing her full duty in this last respect. This is manifest not only in much existing destitution, but also in the fact that secret and many other benevolent societies, are needed to do the work that belongs to the Church, but which she fails to do. Society is becoming increasingly artificial, and thus a larger number than ever depend on situations, which are not easily obtained. Many need advice in reference to worldly matters, and assistance in obtaining means of support, for themselves and their families. On this assumption the Salvation Army is now working among the destitute in England. It will be sure to have much success to the reproach and detriment of the Church. A large number of influential deacons having the high qualifications required by the Apostles, could not only in their respective spheres, but by general combination of effort, prevent the pernicious influence of combines, and help the people, through suitable legislation and other means, to defeat the efforts of those who seek to make colossal fortunes by impoverishing, or burdening with unnecessary taxation, the masses. The Church would become, as of old, a great attraction and refuge to those struggling with poverty and discouragement. The breaches in society would be healed ; socialism would be rebuked

and checked. A work so great and benevolent would command universal respect, and effectually silence the reproaches of scepticism. The restoration of the despised and neglected diaconate may be found to be a simple and adequate remedy for a vast accumulation of evils in both Church and State.

III. MINISTERS AND THEIR POWERS.

Presbyters were associated with Ruling-elders in all acts of government and discipline. In these cases they always acted conjointly or as a tribunal, but never as individuals. They seem to have been appointed towards the end of the period of the "ministry of gifts." Their appointment was provided for by the Lord (Matt. ix : 37, 38 ; xxviii : 19, 20 ; Eph. iv : 11-13). The Church needed and desired a stated ministry, I Thess. v : 20. The Apostles appointed Ruling-elders at once, where they did not previously exist, *i.e.*, in Gentile Churches, Acts xiv : 23 ; but after Crete had enjoyed the labours of Paul, Titus, Zenas and Apollos, Titus was instructed to "set in order the things that were wanting and ordain elders in every city," Titus i : 5. The regular ministry was still wanting ; when it was supplied, the Church's organization and equipment was completed. In this respect, as in all others, the Apostle wished to leave the Church complete. Paul states the qualifications which ministers must possess, so that the Church in all future time might appoint them. (Titus i : 6-11 ; I Tim. iii : 1-7 ; II Tim. ii : 2, 24).

I. GOVERNMENT.—The entire government of the Church was entrusted to them, along with the Ruling-elders. (I Tim. v : 17 ; Titus i : 5 ; I Tim. iii : 4, 5.) Paul, in his last charge to the Elders of Ephesus, committed the Church entirely to their care. They were to

take heed to themselves and to all the flock. (I Peter v : 5 ; Acts xx : 28.) This clearly includes discipline. They were to exert their authority to prevent heresy, and consequent schism, v. 30. It is objected that he does not ascribe to them the specific power of ordination. This, however, is not his subject here. All that he insists on is the exercise of government and discipline, for the reasons expressly stated in the text. The main thing is, that the entire government of the Church, involving the highest exercise of authority, would henceforth devolve on these Elders, as they would see his face no more. It is not to be supposed that he could hold the Presbyters or Elders responsible for soundness in faith and also unity, if they had no power to discipline the teachers of error and schismatics, the grievous wolves. Hence, it has been generally assumed that they had power to deal effectually with such characters. But we do not need to assume anything of the kind, as it is expressly and emphatically stated by the verb *poimaino*, as already explained. Take heed to feed *i.e.*, to rule the Church of God. Not only so, but these Presbyters were to have the oversight of themselves as well as of false teachers or false apostles coming among them. (Rev. ii : 2.) Thus, they had the entire government of the Church of Ephesus and of its Presbyters, and of strangers professing to have even Apostolic authority. The same thing is stated emphatically, I Peter v : 1-5. These two passages prove conclusively that all Church power, the very highest, was entrusted to these men. Paul gave them such power as would enable them to dispense with his oversight. There is no hint that anyone would be placed over them to succeed him ; indeed, there was nothing for a superior officer to do. Paul, referring to

these Elders (I Tim. v : 17), speaks of them as ruling, Proestotes. In I Tim. iii : 4, the Bishop is described as Kalos Proistamenos. Other names of Presbyters indicate government, *e.g.*, Hegoumenoi. (Heb. xiii : 7, 17, 24). It denotes civil governors. (I Peter ii : 14 ; Matt. x : 18 ; Dan. iii : 2 ; Luke xx : 20 ; Acts xxiii : 24, 26). The corresponding duties of Christians are also stated, Heb. xiii : 17, Peithesthe ; I Tim. iii : 4. Thus, Church government devolves on Presbyters, not on Prelates, nor on the people themselves.

Presbyters were associated in Church government ; they always acted conjointly, as a tribunal, never individually. According to Acts xv., Apostles and Elders acted as a superior court of appeal, proving the lawfulness of such courts. There were also present, representatives of the Presbytery of Antioch, and probably from Syria and Cilicia, Acts xv : 23 ; xvi : 4. The case was laid before the Apostles and Elders. They decided it by showing that the mind of the Lord had been already indicated by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on Gentiles and by Old Testament prophecy. The decision was in the name of the Apostles and Elders, v. 23. As an inspired Apostle could have settled the matter without appeal ; as Paul went up by revelation, Gal. ii : 2 ; as Elders sat in court ; and as the appeal was to the word and the providence of God miraculously attested, the case was plainly designed to be a precedent for all time.

The objection of Congregationalists, that this was merely one congregation asking advice of another, is refuted by v. 28 ; and that the consent of the Church was needed to give authority to the decision is contradicted by v. 6, and xvi : 4 ; and also by the revised text of v. 23, "the Apostles and Elders, brethren." There

was n
Gal.
privat
would
multit
in refe
Church
missio
statem
partie
such o
tainin
that t
tions
was e
autho
grega
induc
of dis
hereti
can c
mana
mutu
and i
coun
coun
calle
in a
with
unw
(Pur
are
of o
a p

was no meeting of a congregation at all. According to Gal. ii : 2, Paul and Barnabas went up to confer privately with "them that were of reputation." It would have been foolish to refer such a case to the multitude at Jerusalem as they were strongly prejudiced in reference to the point at issue (xxi : 20). The whole Church (v. 22), can only mean the appellants and commissioners, who were probably numerous. Thus, the statement in v. 22 is important, as it proves that all the parties in the case were satisfied, showing the utility of such courts in securing harmony and peace, while maintaining sound doctrine. The peculiarity in the case is, that the decision was made binding on many congregations that were not represented in the council. This was evidently due to the presence of the Apostles whose authority extended over the whole Church. But Congregationalists themselves hold councils in ordaining, inducting, disciplining, or dismissing a pastor; in cases of disagreement in a congregation, or when it becomes heretical. There is authority in their councils as they can cast off a congregation and its pastor. Councils manage the schemes of their Church. "Councils, both mutual and ex parte, are in cases of necessity suitable and important helps in Church government. A mutual council is one in which the parties on whose behalf the council is called, are agreed. An ex parte council is called by one of the parties, the other refusing to unite in a mutual council. Their decisions are generally left with the Churches. But in deposing from the ministry unworthy incumbents, councils act authoritatively." (Punchard, pp. 103, 104, 164, 261, 263.) These councils are not stated in their meetings, nor are they composed of office-bearers within certain territorial limits. Thus, a person calling an ex parte council can invite his own

friends wherever he can find them. The ministers in these councils are merely congregational delegates. "The Connecticut councils are exceptional." (Punchard, p. 107).

While Presbyterians hold that Church courts are superior to congregations, yet they maintain the equality of congregations with one another, and deny that any congregation has jurisdiction over another. A Presbytery has jurisdiction over pastors and congregations because it includes them virtually and representatively. Dr. Owen says: "Every one who is not connected with such courts is cut off from the external communion of the Church in a most important relation; nor would it be safe for any man to commit his soul to such a Church."

• II. TO LABOUR IN THE WORD AND DOCTRINE.—Presbyters were appointed, officially, to preach the gospel, to teach the Church. This is denied by Prof. Hatch, and also by Plymouth Brethren, Quakers and others. Prof. Hatch (p. 114), "In regard to preaching, it is clear from the Acts and also from Paul's epistles, that the liberty of prophesying prevailed during the Apostolic age." (Acts viii : 4 ; xi : 19-21 ; xiii : 1 ; I Cor. xiv). The first three texts will be considered presently. The fourth avowedly refers to spiritual gifts, not at all to the preaching of the gospel, statedly. The possession of the gift of prophesying was the sole title, in this case, to be heard. It is admitted that there was a time when the ministry of gifts prevailed; but this was temporary, and it did not prevent the institution of a permanent ministry of the word by the Apostles. Proof that preaching is a function of the Presbyter's office is ample, *e.g.*, I Tim. iii : 2 ; v : 17 ; II Tim. ii : 2, 24 ; Tit. i : 9 ; Heb. xiii : 7 ; Rom. xii : 7. That

their office was intended to be permanent, is equally clear, Matt. xiii : 52 ; xxviii : 19, 20 ; Eph. iv : 11-13. Thus their qualifications are indicated, and the means of their support are provided, I Cor. ix : 14 ; Gal. vi : 6, 7.

QUESTION.—Is labouring in the word and doctrine, in every organized congregation, entrusted to them exclusively? The fact that they were appointed in every congregation, teaches that it is so. If a person is called by Christ and by a congregation to labour in the word and doctrine; and if he is ordained and inducted by the Presbytery, what right or occasion has any private member or stranger to usurp his place and functions? or, what right has he to surrender his functions? If such usurpation of government would not be tolerated, much less should that of preaching be. Christians should in their conversation edify one another, but this does not mean labouring in the word. In I Peter iii : 15, they are required to give an account of their hope. In Titus ii : 3-5, aged women are exhorted to be teachers of good things. But Paul says (I Cor. xiv : 34, 35), "It is a shame for women to speak in the Church." It is idle to object that in I Cor. xi : 5, he permitted them to prophesy, but forbade them to do so with their head uncovered. But the Apostle merely indicated the unseemliness of the manner, reserving his direct and explicit prohibition of the thing till he made the statement in ch. xiv. Besides, prophesying was a prophetic gift, so that it ceased with the ministry of gifts. But ch. xiv. forbids the exercise of a prophetic gift by women in public, and even asking questions; while in I Tim. ii : 8-12 he peremptorily forbids women to pray or ask questions in public, and this for reasons that can never lose their force. There

were occasionally inspired women, but there are no cases recorded in the Bible of women preaching under either dispensation.

CUMULATIVE PROOF THAT THE MINISTRY WAS DIVINELY APPOINTED.

1. Ministers as a definite class are designated as presbyters, teachers, labourers in the word and doctrine, ambassadors of Christ, ministers of the New Testament, servants of the Lord, II Cor. v : 20 ; iii : 6 ; II Tim. ii : 21, 24 ; referred to as scribes, Matt. xiii : 52 ; xxiii : 34. 2. They are set by God in the Church, I Cor. xii : 28 ; made ministers of the New Testament, II Cor. iii : 6 ; they are given by Christ to the Church, Eph. iv : 11 ; by Him sent into the vineyard, Matt. ix : 38. They were called and sent forth by the Holy Ghost, Acts xiii : 2, 4. 3. They were appointed by the Apostles, or by others commissioned by the Apostles, I Tim. iii : 1-7 ; II Tim. ii : 2 ; Titus i : 5. 4. Their qualifications are fully stated to guide in their appointment, and to enable Christians to try them, I John iv : 1. 5. Provision was made for their support, so that they might devote their time to study and preaching. 6. Christians are commanded to honour and obey them, Heb. xiii : 7, 17 ; I Thess. v : 12, 13. 7. The idea is conveyed that no officers were placed over them, or required, Acts xx : 25, 28 ; Titus i : 5 ; Peter v : 1-4.

OBJECTIONS.

Neander supposed that all Christians had an inherent right to preach because said to be a royal priesthood, I Peter ii : 9. But this does not refer to preaching, but offering praise for their salvation. It is strange that a man that denies that preachers of the

gospel are priests at all, contends that all Christians have a right to preach because they are called priests. But even calling Israel of old (Ex. xix: 6, quoted by Peter) "a holy nation, a kingdom of priests," did not convey the idea that all had a right to perform priestly functions. Korah, referring to Ex. xix: 6, held the same views as Neander, saying to Moses and Aaron, "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, and the Lord is among them," Numbers xvi: 3. Moses said (v. 5), "the Lord will show who are his and who are holy," and in v. 10, "seek ye the priesthood also?" The result reveals the mistake of supposing that calling them a nation of priests, meant that every individual could perform priestly functions. So that were it said—which it is not—ye are a kingdom of preachers, even this would not prove that all had a right to preach. The Word of God teaches that there must be a divine call. Words denoting priesthood and sacrifice are used in a highly figurative sense in reference to all Christians and their offerings—offering themselves, Rom. xii: 1; offering praise, Heb. xiii: 15, 16; spiritual sacrifices, I Peter ii: 5; sending contributions to Paul, Philip. iv: 18. See also Rom. xv: 16; Philip. ii: 17; Paul's offering himself, II Tim. iv. 6; but in all these there is no allusion to preaching the gospel. It is admitted by Neander that the preaching of all Christians could not be permanent, and that the great majority had to waive their right so that a suitable ministry might be appointed. But why was an impracticable system instituted? or by whose authority was the necessary change made? There was a temporary ministry of gifts; and it was superseded by a stated and permanent ministry appointed by the Apostles. Note what the Reformers meant by the priesthood of all

believers :—"The right of every man and woman, whether lay or cleric, to go to God directly with confession, seeking pardon ; with ignorance, seeking enlightenment ; with solitary loneliness, seeking fellowship ; with frailty and weakness, seeking strength for daily holy living."

Dr. Davidson (Eccl. Pol., p. 267) say "It is the inherent right of every man to preach the gospel, and when invited to do so by a company of believers, he may at once enter on his right and become their pastor." He maintains (p. 251) that "when a person ceases to be the pastor of a Church, he ceases to be a minister of the gospel till he is elected by another." He says that a missionary to the heathen can't be a minister, and that ordination does not belong to him. Thus only one thing is needed to make a man a minister or pastor, *i.e.*, election by the people. Presbyterians hold that three things are required—the call of Christ, election by the people, and ordination by Church officers. In cases of ordination to the ministry only, popular election was dispensed with, Acts xiii : 1-3 ; I Tim. iv : 14 ; Rom. x : 15. The only passage relied on to prove the essential and inherent right of all Christians to preach, is Acts viii : 1-4. But this is not sufficient to set aside the direct and cumulative proof already presented. This was done in an emergency, when even the partial organization of the Church was broken up. A stated ministry was not yet appointed while the ministry of gifts was employed. Besides, those of whose ministry we have an account were prophets, a teacher, and an evangelist. (See Acts viii : 5 ; xi : 19-21, compared with xiii : 1.) The dispersed preachers seem to have been church officers, as the phrase "all were scattered abroad except the Apostles," is absolutely universal ; and as it could not be true of the whole Church,

it must refer to preachers, i.e., to a definite class or number. Popular election, although not all that is needed, is not to be depreciated. There is, however, no direct proof that ministers were called by the people, but there is a strong presumption in its favour, because the ministry was given to the Church, and because God does not now indicate His mind by prophecy, I Tim. iv : 14. But there is reason to believe that popular election to Church offices was universal. Elders were so elected, Acts xiv : 23 compared with II Cor. viii : 19; so were deacons, Acts vi : 5, 6; so were delegates, II Cor. viii : 19, 23; and, in fine, commissioners, Acts xv : 22. Plymouth Brethren, setting aside both popular election and ordination, insist on the call of Christ alone as that which entitles any man to "labour in the word and doctrine." They say that all believers are equal in position, differing only as to the gifts of ruling and preaching, so that even they do not maintain that all Christians have an inherent right to preach the gospel. But Christ gave not merely gifts, but men. Besides, who is to examine and authenticate gifts, especially as there are none now who have the gift of discerning spirits; and as the age of miraculous gifts which authenticate themselves, has passed away. Moreover, congregations are entitled to have a stated ministry of their own choice, and they are bound to support it. They contend that missionaries alone are to be supported by the Church. But see Gal. vi : 6, 7; I Cor. ix : 13, 14. Their polity is thus opposed to the Apostolic organization of the Church, to ordination by Church officers and to popular election.

III. POWERS OF MINISTERS: THEIR RIGHT TO ORDAIN.

1. INDIRECT PROOF.—Ordination is the solemn act of the standing members of Presbytery, by which the belief is indicated that the person has been called by

Christ, and that he possesses the qualifications for office which the Word of God requires; by which he is introduced into the office of the ministry, and commended to the confidence of the Church, with fervent prayer that the subject of it may have all needed grace imparted to him.

Ordination does not make a man a minister, for this Christ does by His Spirit, by His call, Col. iv : 17; Acts xiii : 2; I Tim. i : 18; iv : 14; Eph. iv : 8-11; II Cor. v : 20; Matt. ix : 38. Ordination does not confer qualifications, for the possession of these is the condition on which it is performed, I Tim. iii : 2; Titus i : 7; Acts vi : 3; II Tim. ii : 2. The imposition of hands does not impart grace; Christ by His call does this, and, no doubt, in many cases also in answer to the fervent prayer. Thus ordination does not give power or grace needed by a minister; but it gives ecclesiastical authority to perform all the functions of the ministry. The Apostles never professed to give grace to aid in the Christian life, or to render sacraments or orders valid, I Cor. iii : 6; Acts xviii : 27; xiii : 48; xi : 18; although they conferred miraculous gifts by imposition of hands, Acts viii : 17, 18; xix : 6, 7. Ordination is never spoken of as a mysterious thing. Indeed, there is no specific term used to indicate it, but six words that indicate appointment are so translated, Mark iii : 14; Acts i : 22; xiv : 23; xvii : 31; I Timothy ii : 7; Titus i : 5. Of all these, only Acts xiv : 23, and Titus i : 5 refer to the ordination of Presbyters.

Ordination is never mentioned as a test of a valid ministry, but holding sound doctrine is, II Timothy ii : 2; I John iv : 1-3; II John v : 7, 11; Gal. i : 8, 9.

Importance of Ordination. Paul invariably ordained church officers, and instructed Timothy and Titus to

do so. Even in the special cases of Paul, Barnabas, and Timothy, the Holy Ghost commanded it. If ordination does not make a man a minister, or confer qualifications; if it does not impart mysterious occult qualities, and if it does not furnish a test of a valid ministry, surely Presbyters qualified to preach and govern, and also to discipline, suspend, and depose Presbyters, are competent to ordain, *i.e.*, to judge of qualifications and to authenticate them, and to impart ecclesiastical authority. If they are not, an express statement to this effect would have been needed, and also the appointment of a superior order of officers who should have nothing else to do, both of which are wanting. A blessing may be expected in connection with ordination. Besides, it affords the Church security that only suitable persons will be introduced into the ministry, and that the Church will be responsible for their conduct and their doctrine.

2. DIRECT PROOF.—I Tim. iv : 14 states a clear case of ordination by Presbyters. It is nowhere stated that Paul was present, or that II Tim. i : 6 refers to ordination at all. *Objections*: (a) It is said that Paul ordained and that the others merely assented. This is pure assumption. If Paul was present it was merely in the character of a Presbyter, in which he could not perform an Apostolic function. (b) That Meta indicates that Presbyters were associated with Paul. But Meta denotes the instrument, as in Acts xiii : 17; xiv : 27; xv : 4. Supposing that Meta here means "with," what things does it connect? Not the imposition of hands by the Presbytery with the ordaining act of Paul, who is not here mentioned at all, but the imposition of hands by the Presbytery with the prophecy referred to, it was by revelation and imposition of hands. (c) That

"Presbyterian" denotes not the ordainers, but the office of Presbyter. But the only other passages in which it occurs denote a body of Presbyters, Luke xxii : 66 ; Acts xxii : 5. Besides, this would be a plain statement that Timothy was merely a Presbyter, which our opponents deny. All the Presbyters ordained by Timothy and Titus were presbyterially ordained. That the latter were not Apostles or Prelates will be shown in due time. The service referred to in Acts xiii : 1-4, although, perhaps, not strictly an ordination, yet so nearly resembles it that it is admitted that the prophets and teachers who could do the one were surely competent to do the other. It is said that ordination is the act of the standing members of Presbytery, *i.e.*, ministers. The Form of Church Government in Confession of Faith says, "Every minister of the word is to be ordained by imposition of hands and prayer with fasting by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong," Acts xiv : 23 ; xiii : 3 ; I Tim. v : 22. It was some time ago much discussed by the American Presbyterian Church, whether ministers only are competent to ordain, *i.e.*, virtually, whether ordination is a part of Church government, or a matter of order. If the former, it was said that Elders should take part in it. The American Presbyterian Church decided that they should not. It is partly an official act of ministers receiving one into their number, and it is always so expressed in the usual words of welcome.

THE SOURCE, NATURE AND SPHERE OF CHURCH POWER.

1. SOURCE OF POWER.—In private and voluntary societies, power is derived from the consent and appointment of the members of such societies. But as the Church is a divine institution, and as its ministers

are called by Christ, and are His servants, their power is derived from Him. At His death He did not surrender the government of the Church, but entered upon it. He has no vicar on earth. Officers in their collective capacity have His sanction to their decisions when in harmony with His Word. (Acts xv: 28; Matt. xviii: 18.) Thus Christ is the fountain of authority, life and blessing to the Church, and not officers having treasures of grace to be withheld or dispensed independently of Him.

2. THE NATURE OF CHURCH POWER.—It is spiritual, Matt. xx: 20-28; xxii: 16-21; John xviii: 36, 37. It is ministerial, not legislative. It must be regulated by the Word of God. There are examples, regulations and also principles, with what may be fairly deduced from them, for the guidance of church officers. But they have no right to enact laws which shall bind the consciences of the people. They can explain, declare and apply the laws of Christ, subject to a final appeal to the Word of God. These are the conditions of the Church's liberty. (See Confession of Faith, xxxi: 3; i: 6; xx: 2; xxi: 1.) These passages should be carefully studied and mastered by students.

3. SPHERE IN WHICH CHURCH POWER IS EXERCISED.—(1) There is Potestas Dogmatica, authority in matter of doctrine. This does not entitle the Church to give authority to the Word of God, to add to it by traditions, and by the promised aid of Christ's presence; nor to interpret Scripture so as to bind the consciences of Christians. But Presbyters should explain and defend the Word of God, Heb. xiii: 7-9; Eph. iv: 8-15; Titus i: 9-11. As errorists often found their doctrines on Scripture, it is necessary that confessions be drawn up, and approved by the Church, II Tim. i: 13. Acts

xv. is plainly an explanatory article in reference to justification by faith ; so are also the statements in John 1 : 14 ; and I John iv : 2, 3 in reference to the person of Christ ; and also II Tim. ii : 17, 18, and I Tim. i : 19, 20, in opposition to those who held that the resurrection is merely figurative. Church Confessions are subordinate to the Word of God. Hence a blind assent to them is not to be demanded, Gal. i : 8 ; Confession of Faith i : 4, 10 ; xxxi : 3. We cannot call our Confession perfect ; to do so would make it equal to the Word of God. Doctrines might be stated more accurately ; additions might be made to meet new cases, or new errors ; testimonies against obsolete errors might be left out. Although the Word of God is immutable, yet error is constantly changing, and should be testified against. Our Confession of Faith was not intended to be a test of membership, but a test of ministerial communion. (See the Def. of the Visible Church, and Q. 95, Shorter Catechism.)

(2) There is Potestas Diataktike, which refers to canons and constitutions relating to the administration of ordinances and government. So far as enforcing the laws of Christ is concerned, there is no dispute. But subordinate matters, in reference to which there is no express command, must be regulated according to the spirit of the Word of God and Christian prudence, Confession of Faith i : 6 ; xxxi : 3, *e.g.*, the decree in reference to eating blood, washing the disciples' feet, and other things which were evidently temporary. A distinction must be made between not following Apostolic practice in such things, and enacting rules for which there is no Apostolic authority. Among such things we are not to place Church government, as in reference to it we have ample Scripture authority ; nor Romish

penances, fasts, pilgrimages, the observance of Christmas, Good Friday and the rite of confirmation, for none of which is there any Scripture authority whatever. We do not approve of the XX Article of the Church of England: "Whatever is not expressly forbidden in Scripture, the Church may enact on her own authority." The Confession of Faith teaches that whatever is not expressly sanctioned by, or fairly deducible from, the Word of God is not to be enjoined. (Confession of Faith xx: 2; Shorter Catechism 58; Larger Catechism 109.)

(3) There is *Potestas Diakritike*—disciplinary authority, Confession of Faith xxx. This is spiritual, including oversight, admonition, suspension from Church privileges or from office, and excommunication. (I Cor. v: 6, 7; II Thess. iii: 6, 14, 15; II Cor. x: 8; II John v: 10, 11.) As Christ has drawn a line between the things of Cæsar and the things of God, Romanists are wrong in placing the government of the Church over that of the State; and Erastians are equally wrong in placing the government of the State over that of the Church. They are distinct, occupying different spheres, but co-ordinate. The XXXVII Article of the Church of England is Erastian.

II. EXTRAORDINARY CHURCH OFFICERS.

All that I am concerned to prove is that their offices and peculiar powers and duties were extraordinary and temporary. Proof that the Apostolic office was extraordinary and temporary: (1) The name Apostle, in its technical sense, is not given to any who were not of the original number, to which no addition is possible. (Luke vi: 13; I Cor. xv: 8, 9; Jude 17: Rev. xviii: 20; xxi: 14.) Matthias and Paul were the only exceptions. But

Matthias' appointment was made to fill up a blank in the original number of witnesses of our Lord's resurrection, and to fulfil prophecy. Paul declares that his appointment was exceptional, and the very last. The fact that their names are inscribed in the Holy Jerusalem, and that the Church is built upon them, Eph. ii : 20, shows that they are permanently related to the whole Church as its foundation, or founders, and hence they could have no successors, a succession of foundations being absurd. Some passages are said to disprove this designed restriction of Apostolos (Rom. xvi : 7), "men of note among the Apostles," or "eminent Apostles." The former is to be preferred, as these were evidently obscure persons, and one of them was perhaps a woman. In I Thess., Silvanus and Timothy are united with Paul in the salutation, hence he says (ii : 6), "we might have been burdensome *as* the Apostles of Christ." It is implied that he calls them all Apostles of Christ. But the salutation does not make them all joint authors of the epistle. If *we* denotes these three men, ch. ii : 2 will contradict the Acts, as it makes Timothy a fellow-sufferer with Paul. Besides, Paul in ii : 18 uses *we* in reference to himself ; and *as* or *like* will make good sense if the reference is to the twelve Apostles. In Phil. ii : 25, Paul calls Epaphroditus "your Apostle ;" but this is explained in iv : 18. In II Cor. viii : 23, we read of the Apostles of the Churches, but not of Christ. One was elected to carry donations. They do not seem to have been church officers. In Acts xiv : 4, 14, Paul and Barnabas are called Apostles. But Barnabas is never elsewhere, alone, called an Apostle, nor even here an Apostle of Jesus Christ. They were missionaries of the Church at Antioch, Acts xiii : 1-4 ; xiv : 26, 27. In Rev. ii : 2 ; II Cor. xi : 13, we read of "false Apostles." But

these may have pretended to be messengers of Churches, or to be some of the true Apostles where they were not personally known, or to have received an independent commission. The existence of such Apostles may prove that there had been, or were, true Apostles, but not that there was a succession of Apostles, the very point at issue. Paul attaches much importance to the title "Apostle." He is careful never to call Timothy or Titus "Apostles." In II Cor. i : 1 ; Col. i : 1, he calls Timothy a brother and himself an Apostle of Jesus Christ. It should be noticed that as the three words used to designate church officers were Greek words in good use, they must have two meanings in Scripture, the common and the technical. Thus diaconos denotes a domestic servant, a church officer generally, and a deacon. Presbuteros sometimes means older, Luke xv : 25 ; John viii : 9 ; an old man, I Tim. v : 1 ; sometimes a presbyter. Apostolos denotes one sent, John xiii : 16, and an Apostle of Jesus Christ. If there were Apostle-Bishops, who were successors of the Apostles, they are never mentioned in the New Testament. (2) Proof that the Apostolic office was extraordinary and temporary, is furnished by the special qualifications and work of the Apostles. They were appointed immediately by the Lord, Luke vi : 13 ; John xx : 21-23 ; Matt. xxviii : 19, 20. Paul was no exception, Gal. i : 1. Besides, they had seen the Lord, and were qualified and appointed to attest His resurrection. (Acts i : 21, 22 ; iv : 33 ; x : 40, 41 ; I Cor. ix : 1 ; xv : 8.) Eye-witnesses can have no successors. Moreover, they wrought miracles and conferred miraculous gifts. (Acts viii : 17, 18 ; xix : 6 ; II Cor. xii : 12.) Further, they were instructed in the gospel by Christ himself, or by divine inspiration, Gal. i ; 11, 12. In fine, they were commissioned to teach

all nations, thus they had no local charge. (Acts i : 8 ; Matt. xxviii : 19 ; Mark xvi : 15 ; Rom. xv : 20 ; II Cor. xi : 28.) The Apostle James seems to have remained mainly at Jerusalem. But he is never spoken of as acting as a prelate. Whatever position he held in the council (Acts xv.), the decree did not go forth in his name. He also acted with the Elders, Acts xxi : 18 ; the other references to him are, Acts xii. 17 ; Gal. ii : 9. Some contend that he was not an Apostle. If so, on the Patristic theory, he was placed above the Apostles. But he was evidently an Apostle, Gal. i : 19 ; I Cor. xv : 7. (3) Proof that the Apostolic office was extraordinary and temporary, is that no instructions were given to appoint successors to the Apostles ; there is no statement of their qualifications ; there is no example of their appointment, while all these are found in reference to Presbyters and Deacons. As the Church spread over the world, the Apostles must have had occasion to appoint Apostles, if such officers were required at all, as a permanent order. It is admitted that the distinctive qualifications of Apostles were not continued, and also, that some Apostolic powers are held by Presbyters. It must be evident that the powers of Presbyters that we have ascertained and proved, combined with the special powers of Apostles, include all the powers that the Apostles possessed. If there are any intermediate powers between these, they are not stated in the Word of God. (4) Proof that the Apostolic office was extraordinary and temporary, is that there is no inherent necessity for the continuance of it.

PRELATIC OBJECTIONS.—(a) That when the Lord said, " As my Father sent me so send I you " (John xx : 21-23), He transmitted to the Apostles the power and authority that He had received from the Father, because

He breathed on them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" He imparted or transferred to them His own power, enabling them to communicate the Holy Ghost to their successors, and that, too, perpetually. (b) That Christ was an Apostle sent by the Father (Heb iii. 1), and that the Apostles were His successors, and that Diocesan Bishops are their successors, John xx : 21-23 ; Matt. xxviii : 19, 20. (c) It is maintained that Apostolic Succession is taught in II Tim. ii : 2, while there is analogical proof in the succession of Jewish priests.

REPLY:—1st. The doctrine of sacramental grace, or grace of orders, tactually transmitted, is unscriptural. Ordination does not impart grace and qualifications, but authenticates them. I do not deny, however, that ordination may be a precious means of grace to the parties concerned in it. Besides, although the Apostles by the imposition of hands imparted miraculous gifts, Acts viii : 17, 18 ; xix : 6, yet they never professed to impart grace for office, or for the Christian life. Moreover, the word in John xx : 21 (the word "as") could not mean that Christ gave the same power to the Apostles that the Father gaveto Him, without making the Apostles equal with Himself. The reference of the equality is to that of the Son with the Father, not to that of the Apostles with Christ. This meaning is plainly stated in John xvii : 18. The fact that Christ breathed on them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost ; whosoever sins ye remit," etc., does not show that the Apostles could do the same thing. The fact that they received the Holy Ghost, does not define their powers, but merely indicates that they were thus qualified for their work. The nature of their qualifications is to be ascertained from such specific statements as are on the preceding page and these include inspiration and miraculous powers

that no Diocesan lays claim to. In Matt. xxviii : 19, 20, the Lord addressed the Apostles as preachers, and as representatives of preachers to the end of time, and promised to be with them in preaching and not in ordaining others to preach, a thing not mentioned, or even expressly referred to, although implied in continuing the ministry, which is plainly to be done by these preachers. In the Ordinal of the Church of England, the Bishop addresses the Priest thus : "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." In Heb. iii : 1, Christ is spoken of as the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, *i.e.*, of professed Christians in all ages ; and surely not merely a founder of an order of Priests to whom there is no reference in the passage. To make II Tim. ii : 2 relevant, the following things must be begged : That ordination, although not mentioned, is the main thing referred to ; that derivative succession is an absolute necessity ; and that fidelity, soundness in the faith, and aptness to teach, which only are mentioned, are of no account whatever.

The analogy of Old Testament priests cannot be binding without express command. Their employment was entirely different from that of gospel ministers, and they were connected with the sacrificial system which has been abolished, and their succession was hereditary. If even the latter point is given up, the analogy is surrendered, as the salient point here is the succession. After the Roman Conquest, the succession was hopelessly broken. But although Caiaphas could not be a legitimate successor of the earlier High Priests, yet the Lord recognized his authority. But why select the

priesthood as the basis of analogy? It was no more a type of Christ's mediatorial character than the offices of king and prophet. Ministers of the gospel are, in no official sense, priests. It would be more appropriate, although not correct, to call them prophets, as prophets preached in the time of the Apostles.

2nd. It is impossible to prove either Prelatic or Presbyterian succession, supposing such a thing to be necessary. An explanation of terms will show this. When Prelatists speak of the necessity of a succession of officers, they mean absolute necessity, while Presbyterians mean only relative necessity, *i.e.*, scriptural, and conservative of good order, which can be dispensed with only in extraordinary circumstances. Besides, when Prelatists speak of succession, they mean derivative succession; whereas Presbyterians mean ordinary sequence in office, recognized in the usual way. Moreover, Prelatists profess to prove for themselves only a general succession through connection with a Prelatic Church, while they demand of Presbyterians proof of a particular succession from Apostles or Apostolic Presbyters. But even a general succession, such as they profess to have, cannot be proved. Who can trace the succession through the dark ages? Even the beginning of succession in Rome, as will be shown in due time, cannot be proved. Who can prove that ordination is the only condition of a valid succession, and that immorality and heresy cannot invalidate it? How alarming would it be were the validity of the ministry and sacraments dependent on a succession that cannot be proved. Archbishop Whately exposes "the fallacy of confounding together the unbroken succession of a Christian ministry, generally, and the same succession in an unbroken line of this or that individual

minister. One may say to his pastor, you teach me that my salvation depends on the possession by you of a certain qualification ; and when I ask for proof that you possess it, you prove to me that it is possessed, generally, by a certain class of persons of which you are one, and probably by a large majority of them." He shows that in transmitting sacramental grace, every thing depends on that particular minister and the evidence of his personally having the succession. Anglicans, therefore, must present proof of the particular succession which they demand of Presbyterians, which, of course, cannot be produced.

3rd. Supposing that succession could be proved it would be of no value. The end for which the ministry was instituted is the maintenance of Gospel truth and its adjuncts. But succession does not secure this. Besides, the succession does not furnish a single distinctive mark by which true ministers may be distinguished from others. Christians are required to try the spirits by a doctrinal standard. (I John iv : 1 ; I Thess. v : 21 ; Gal. i : 8, 9.) Moreover, Christ presides in His Church, and our connection with Him is direct, and not through a long succession of men who are dead. Christ calls men into the ministry, qualifies them, is with them, gives testimony to their preaching, and renders sacraments effectual by the working of His Spirit in the hearts of them that by faith receive them. Thus the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is unscriptural incapable of proof, and of no practical utility. —We admit that the Apostles were the first ministers of Christ ; and that all other gospel ministers are their successors in all those functions of their office which were intended to be perpetual. In this sense we believe in the Apostolic Succession.

But Anglicans incorporate with it two assumptions, for which there is no warrant in Scripture, and no proof in recorded facts either in the New Testament or in the earliest Christian writings. First, they assume that the twelve Apostles were the divinely appointed "Depositaries" of all the official grace in the Church ; and secondly, that from them, as from a sacred fountain, the grace of office, without which no ministerial act is valid, can be transmitted only through diocesan Bishops descending in regular succession from the Apostles, and possessing the exclusive right and power of ordination. This is what is meant by "the Historic Episcopate," which the Episcopal Church co-ordinates with the Holy Scriptures and with the administration of sacraments, in their overture for the reunion of Christendom.* But, upon this principle, what becomes of the Prelatic contention that Timothy and Titus, and others, were Apostolic-Bishops, successors of the Apostles, and appointed by an Apostle ? Besides, what becomes of all the alleged Scripture proof of Episcopacy ? Moreover, as the Apostles appointed Presbyters to preach the gospel, dispense sacraments, and exercise government, what prevented their appointing successors to themselves in their peculiar functions ? And as the Church extended among all nations, while the number of the Apostles gradually diminished, how could the appointment of Bishops be dispensed with as long as any Apostles remained ? Why did not the Apostles, at least, predict the rise of such an order, and state the qualifications and duties which should belong to it ?

* Mr. Gladstone says : " To expect a full account of the establishment of an order whose function it was to replace the Apostles, is precluded by the nature of the case, as Scripture only records what took place during the lifetime of the Apostles."

especially as they gave such ample information in reference to inferior orders. The answer is simple. Apostolic-Bishops were not appointed because they are not needed, and because there are no special powers for them to exercise, without either perpetuating powers which belonged to the Apostles, personally, or depriving ministers of the gospel of powers which belonged to them, thus changing the polity which the Apostles instituted.

EVANGELISTS.

The name occurs only three times, Eph. iv : 11 ; Acts xxi : 8 ; II Tim. iv : 5. Prelatic writers, failing to prove that Timothy and Titus were supreme Apostles, maintain that being Evangelists, they were Apostle-Bishops, the one at Ephesus, the other at Crete. Others contend that the office is a permanent one, and that to it belongs a class of men who exercise an itinerant ministry among settled congregations—ignoring, assisting, or superseding the regular pastors. The true way to ascertain the technical meaning of the term, is to examine all the passages that refer to labours of Evangelists, and the sphere over which their labours extended. Philip was originally a Deacon (Acts vi.) ; but at the dispersion (Acts viii.), he seems to have gone down as an Evangelist to Samaria, where he preached and wrought miracles (viii : 5, 12, 13), he thus preceded the Apostles as an inferior officer, 14-19. He next went by divine appointment towards Gaza, v. 29, where he preached to and baptized the Ethiopian ; thence he continued preaching till he arrived at Cæsarea, v. 40, where Paul visited him, xxi : 8. As Timothy's ministry was that of an Evangelist (II Tim. iv : 5) ; as Titus was similarly

employed, and as we have a pretty full account of their labours, we may by considering their employment have a correct idea of the work or ministry of an Evangelist. (1st.) Evangelists seem to have possessed spiritual gifts, (Acts viii : 6,7,13 ; II Tim. i : 6) ; this, of course, places these among extraordinary officers. (2nd.) They were personal attendants on Apostles, and travelled as extensively as the Apostles. This is, also, another Apostolic characteristic. Timothy joined Paul at Lytra (Acts xvi : 1-4) ; was at Ephesus and was sent to Macedonia (xix : 22 ; I Cor. iv : 17 ; xvi : 10) ; was sent to Ephesus to repress the growth of error during Paul's absence (I Tim. i : 3) ; was with Paul at Macedonia II Cor. i : 1 ; accompanied Paul in his last journey to Jerusalem, Acts xx ; was with him at Rome, Col. i : 1 ; Philip. i : 1 ; was sent as a delegate to Philippi, Philip. ii : 19-23 ; was sent for to Rome by Paul, II Tim. iv, 9, 21 ; there he seems to have been arrested, and when set at liberty purposed to travel Eastward, Heb. xiii : 23. Titus was with Paul at Jerusalem, Gal. ii : 1 ; at Corinth, II Cor. vii : 6, 14 ; was at Crete, Titus i : 5 ; at Nicopolis, Titus iii : 12 ; at Dalmatia, II Tim. iv : 10. These Evangelists were employed in completing the organization of churches formed by Paul in correcting irregularities, and thus assisting the Apostle in his specific work I Cor. xvi : 10 ; I Tim. i : 3 ; Titus i : 5. They were messengers of the Apostle by whom epistles were sent, and communication was kept up, I Cor. xvi : 19 ; II Cor. vii : 6, 8 ; Eph. vi : 21, 22. Thus the whole period of the labour of these Evangelists till the end of Paul's life is accounted for, showing that they had no local charge, that they were itinerant like the Apostles and were engaged as assistants of the Apostle. By leaving them to organize churches, Paul was able to do much more Apostolic

work than he could otherwise have done. In ordaining Presbyters II Tim. 11 : 2 ; I Tim. iii : 1-7, 15 ; and exercising government and discipline, I Tim. v : 19 ; they, no doubt, acted constitutionally, as Paul himself did, respecting popular suffrage, and acting in conjunction with other officers, as at Ephesus and Crete, and where there were no officers, acting individually by Apostolic authority. (3rd.) Timothy was officially inferior to Paul. In Acts xix : 22 this is manifest. He is not mentioned as being with Paul and Silas at Philippi, Acts xvi : 19-40. In xvii : 4, 10, Timothy is not mentioned, although he was with them vv. 14, 15 ; xviii : 5. Paul addressing Timothy or speaking of him—II Cor. i : 1 ; Col. i : 1—never calls him an Apostle even when he calls himself one. There is not much importance to be attached to the term “brother,” but to the fact that in these places he is not called an Apostle, especially as Paul attaches so much importance to this title. It may be said (Phil. v : 1) that Timothy is called a brother when, in point of fact, he was also a prisoner. But prisoner is not a title of office like Apostle ; besides, he was at liberty at the time referred to, Heb. xiii : 23. Even in his last Epistle (iv : 5), he tells them to do the work of an Evangelist. Had he been an Apostle, how could the title have been withheld here ? He also directs Timothy’s movements, and gives such instructions as implied official superiority and authority. The intelligent and careful reader cannot fail to perceive this. Prelatists object that Timothy was instructed to perform functions to which Presbyters or Evangelists are not equal, *æ.g.*, to exercise discipline over Presbyters, I Tim. v : 19. But this is merely begging the whole question. Besides, it is not said that he was to exercise judgment in this case. But, as we have seen in Acts

xx: 28 ; I Peter v : 2, Presbyters were competent to exercise the highest discipline over Presbyters. He did not need to do this alone, as there were other Presbyters at Ephesus. Prelatists object that Timothy could not ordain Presbyters merely as a Presbyter, I Tim. v : 22. But we do not know that this passage refers to ordination at all, or especially to the ordination of ministers of the gospel. Timothy was ordained by a Presbytery himself, I Tim. iv : 14. He might have the Ephesian Presbyters associated with him. If a man must be ordained by an officer higher than himself, who is to ordain the highest officers? As to discipline, all a freeman can ask is to be tried by his peers. To enjoy this, of course, a minister should not become a member of a congregation. Thus the office of an Evangelist was temporary, because it was closely related to that of Apostle, which had the whole world for its sphere, and had also miraculous gifts attached to it ; because its qualifications and duties are not stated, but merely the work accomplished by it ; and because no instructions are given to perpetuate it. It is very evident that Evangelists, especially Timothy and Titus, were officially inferior to Apostles ; and that, as admitted, there were no officers between Apostles and Presbyters ; their ordinary functions were those of Presbyters.

PROPHETS.

The Prophets were inspired preachers of the gospel, Eph. ii : 29 ; iv : 11. They sometimes foretold events, Acts xi : 27-30 ; xx : 23 ; xxi : 10, 11. They were inspired expositors of gospel doctrine. Thus they generally followed the Apostles, watering what the Apostles had sown. This was needed before the New Testament was written and published. Thus none of

their teachings are found in the sacred canon, as they merely taught what is contained in the New Testament. Their labours were not specially for the conversion of sinners, but for the edification of the Church, I Cor. xiv: 3, 4, 22. Still their holy fervour, the subjective style of their address, and their ability to apply the truth to the conscience, tended not only to edify and comfort believers, but to convince and convict sinners, I Cor. xiv: 22, 24, 25. Their splendid gifts shed lustre on the Apostolic Church, and conduced to its edification and extension, while they lasted.

PATRISTIC.

Ecclesiastical Polity, during the first two or three centuries, is here referred to, not to add authority to the Word of God, nor to explain what it teaches, nor to decide difficulties of exegesis which are mainly due to perverse ingenuity, but to show that the polity instituted by the Apostles continued long after their decease, and was gradually and sporadically changed. This is needed to counteract Prelatic strategy. Prelatists, failing to find support for their polity in the Bible, long maintained that it contains only the germ of Prelacy, which sprung up and ripened after the Apostles' death, either immediately or in a short time. But recently failing to find much needed support in the Apostolic Fathers and other writers down to the middle of the third century, some Prelatists now try to prove that no uniform polity is to be found even in this period, all being chaotic and not reduced to a system till the Nicene, which is called a formative, period. While others, like Prof. Hatch, contend that Church government is a divine institution only in the sense in which civil government is, Rom. xiii: 1, thus leaving

Church polity to be regulated by the light of nature, in conformity to civil institutions and national taste. In Church literature only contemporary testimony can be admitted, as the matter is one of fact, not of opinion. The testimony of anonymous and even of corrupted writings may be admitted, if there be evidence that they existed in their present form in the age to which they are known to belong.

Several serious mistakes deserve to be pointed out.

1. It is maintained that as Prelacy existed in the Primitive Church, it must have arisen by Apostolic appointment, or by some recognized inherent necessity. But on this principle you can find Apostolic or reasonable support for all the errors of Romanism. Besides, in point of fact, it did not exist in its mediæval, or even modern, form for hundreds of years after the death of the Apostles.
2. That while *Episcopos* is equivalent to *Presbuteros* in the New Testament, Acts xx: 17, 28; Titus i: 5, 7, yet immediately after the Apostles' time it denoted a Diocesan. Related to this is the gratuitous assumption that the chairman of a body of Presbyters must be a Diocesan, either real or apparent.
3. That when Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon are stated together, a form that does not occur in the New Testament, Bishop must denote a Diocesan. This can be corrected by showing that a Bishop in the modern sense is not a congregational officer, but the overseer, of a large number of congregations and their pastors. To determine this point the question is, What are the person's qualifications, functions and sphere of labour? The answer will show whether he is a Diocesan or a Presbyter.
4. That congregations were independently organized, at first. Whereas, in cities like Corinth and Rome, before there were Church buildings, a number of

Presbyters laboured conjointly ; while it was only in small towns and rural districts that single congregations were independently organized. In the one case you find a Presbytery, in the other a Session, exercising government, but in neither a Diocesan. Keeping these mistakes in mind and assuming, as we are entitled to do, that the polity instituted by the Apostles did continue some time after their death, we shall view the records of Primitive Church polity in the light shed on them by the Scriptures, and not vice versa, as Prelatists do, and especially as Prof. Hatch avowedly does.

(1.) Testimony of Clement of Rome A.D. 97. In his Epistle to the Corinthians, long read in Churches, the salutation is "The Church of God sojourning at Rome, to the Church of God sojourning at Corinth." One congregation addresses another, both having the same constitution, and each being a single parish. In chapter xlii, he says that "the Apostles appointed everywhere Bishops and Deacons," quoting Isaiah lx : 17. "I will appoint their Bishops in righteousness, and their Deacons in faith;" thus the same polity was instituted by all the Apostles. In chapter xlv, Bishop and Presbyter are used as convertible terms, as in the New Testament ; and it is said that the Apostles desired that the polity that they instituted should be permanent, as they were taught by their Divine Master that the oversight or episcopate would occasion strife. Popular election is also recognized. Succession is not derivative but merely sequence in office. Chapter xlvii, rebukes the most steadfast Churches of the Corinthians for rebelling against its Presbyters. Chapter liv exhorts the flock to live on terms of peace with the Presbyters set over it ; at the same time, it hints that in certain circumstances a Presbyter would act nobly by resigning.

Chapter lvii exhorts the leaders of the sedition to submit to the Presbyters, and to receive correction so as to repent. These are all the references to polity in the Epistle. It is evident that the Church at Corinth continued Presbyterian as Paul left it. These quotations effectually disprove the Prelatic contention, that this Church was exceptional in its government, and that it was fickle. See chapter xlii, xlvii. It is to be regretted that in chapter xlix, Clement compares the Jewish priesthood to the Christian ministry. This is the germ, it is supposed, from which the theory of the Hierarchy sprung. This, however, is on the part of Clement only a matter of opinion, or rather a rhetorical illustration, not of testimony. It is supposed that in chapter xlv, Clement assumes that the people have the right of deposing their ministers, as he insists only on the excellency of the men as the reason why it should not be done. This is not sustained by chapter xlvii. Besides, it is a matter of opinion of Clement or of the people, and hence of no authority. From chapter xlii, it is evident that Clement understood John xx: 21 better than the Anglicans. He says, "The Apostles preached the gospel to us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ has done so from God. Christ therefore was sent forth by God, and the Apostles by Christ." He had no idea of Christ's transferring to the Apostles the power which He had received from the Father.

(2.) The teaching of the twelve Apostles, A.D. 100-120, discovered 1873, was not intended to set forth Apostolic doctrine or polity, but merely Apostolic precepts for the guidance of Christian conduct, like the Epistle of James. Hence church officers are referred to merely incidentally, and only when their duties are stated. Stated officers were Bishops and Deacons,

appointed by popular election, there being several in every congregation. Their service was that of prophets and teachers. They were to be similarly honoured (lines 277-282). There were Apostles, too, and also prophets, evidently itinerant preachers, with this difference between the two, a prophet might settle and become a pastor and be supported (253-266), but an Apostle might not; he must travel continuously, and not remain more than two days in one place, and when he leaves he must take nothing except bread enough till he lodge again (216-225). Congregations may do without prophets (260). Prophets must be judged and so also must Apostles, according to a Scripture standard of doctrine and conduct. If they teach unsound doctrine or seek money they are to be declared false Apostles and to be expelled (209-253). Ordination is not mentioned. Apostles were evidently viewed with suspicion (Rev. ii: 2; II Cor. xi: 13), and treated with less respect than Prophets, Bishops and Deacons. There is a wide difference between the twelve Apostles, whose authority was paramount, and those who called themselves Apostles. It is probable that the Prophets continued to flourish some time after the Apostles, although their services were not considered necessary. It is evident that Church polity, when the "Teaching" was written, was Presbyterian. It is sad that Profs. Hitchcock and Brown, who translate and annotate the Teaching, say "its Ecclesiology is embryonic. (Introduction, p. 88), and that it refers to a very secluded part of the Church," (p. 90). While they admit that it is Presbyterian, the stated and permanent officers being Bishops and Deacons, they say that "it seems necessary to insist on the measure of respect due to these officers, as if their position were not wholly assured"

(281). Will this apply to I Thess. v : 12, 13; Heb. xiii : 7, 17? They say "that the injunctions about baptism, the eucharist, and reproof and discipline are addressed to Christians, as such, and would seem to involve common responsibilities and privileges," as it officers had no functions superior to those of private Christians or members. But Paul addresses the Corinthians in this style, although he refers to their officers who were in the Church. Is the Ecclesiology of the New Testament embryonic? Prelatists say so.

(3.) Testimony from Polycarp and his congregation A.D. 150-170. The salutation in his epistle to the Philippians is "Polycarp and the presbyters with him to the Church of God sojourning at Philippi." The Church at Philippi was a single congregation, its officers were presbyterians and deacons, evidently the same that Paul called bishops and deacons. Chaps. 5, 6, 11, show that the entire government of the Church devolved on presbyters. Chap. 5 shows that the deacons were almoners of the Church, and that their qualifications were what Paul required in I Tim. iii : 8-13. Polycarp writes as if there was a firmly established government and sets forth the corresponding duties of officers and people. The salutation of the Church in Smyrna, which gives an account of Polycarp's martyrdom, "the Church of God which sojourns at Smyrna," shows that it was a single congregation and that Polycarp was its pastor. In chap. 16, it calls him "an illustrious teacher." In chap. 16, it calls him "an apostolic and prophetic teacher and bishop." While the Churches at Corinth and Philippi are admitted by all parties to have been presbyterian, the Church at Smyrna was evidently a single congregation. It had an illustrious teacher or bishop and a body of presbyters with him. In this case

the presbyters must have been ruling-elders. Thus, one congregation had a bishop, elders and deacons. This is in perfect harmony with the Ignatian Epistles, as will be seen presently. Looking at Polycarp's functions as a ruler and the teacher of a single congregation, you perceive that he was not a diocesan, but a congregational bishop, *i.e.*, its pastor. These are most ancient and reliable documents.

(4.) Testimony of Justin Martyr, A.D. 140, Apol. chaps. 65-67. Justin was not a church officer, but he travelled among the Churches and he resided a long time at Rome. He notices church officers only incidentally, when describing the public worship of all the Churches. In his first apology addressed to the Roman Emperor, he mentions only the president and deacons, the "proestos" and deacons. The whole charge, or congregation of the proestos, whether in city, or country, assembles in one place on the day of the sun. He reads the Scriptures, instructs and exhorts and also dispenses the Lord's Supper, using wine mingled with water. The deacons carry a portion of the elements to those who are absent. At the conclusion of the service there is a collection taken up for the poor. Those who are in prosperous circumstances, and wish to do so, give what they will, each according to his choice. The president offers up prayers and thanksgivings with all his might, and the people say, Amen. It is admitted that the proestos is simply the pastor. Ruling-elders need not be mentioned, as there is no reference to government and discipline at all. The proestos also visits the sick and destitute, and relieves them with the collections.

(5.) Testimony from Hermas, Rome, about A.D. 150. The real author is not known. It has been called the "Pilgrim's Progress" of the second and third cen-

turies. It deals largely with repentance, and contains the germ of the Roman Penance, which occasioned the Novation controversy and the Donatist Schism of a century later. In Clark's edition, p. 331, there is reference to "the presbyters who preside over the Church at Rome, Senioribus qui præsunt." Page 341 contains these words: "I now say to you who preside—præstes—over the Church and love the first seats, primos concessus." It is said p. 427, "Bishops (*i.e.* presidents of the Churches) given to hospitality." P. 331, "But you will read the words in this city, along with the presbyters who preside over the Church." P. 426, "Servants—diakonoi—who discharge their duty ill, and who plundered widows and orphans." The other references are unimportant, pp. 329, 336, 419, 420, 427. Thus, a plurality of presbyters presided over the Church at Rome; bishop and presbyter are used as convertible terms; while the explanation of bishops placed within brackets—not in the Greek text at all—may indicate that the term was beginning to be restricted to pastors, as distinguished from other presbyters; while deacons had the care of widows and of the poor. "These statements are of priceless value to us; they show us as through a medium of transparent crystal, that the Roman Church, at least as late as A.D. 150, was still governed, or presided over by the College of presbyters, and that their chairman, president, or bishop was as yet a comparatively humble and unimportant personage" (Mossman, p. 342). We have the following list of primitive Roman Bishops:—Irenæus: 1, Peter; 2, Linus; 3, Anacletus; 4, Clemens. Tertullian: 1, Peter; 2, Clemens; 3, Linus; 4, Anacletus. Augustin: 1, Peter; 2, Linus; 3, Clement; 4, Anacletus. There is no doubt that all these men, except Peter, pre-

sided over the Church at Rome. These statements can be easily harmonized by noticing that they were presbyters of equal rank, and by supposing, as is most natural that Linus and Anacletus were each twice moderator of Presbytery, and Clemens three times.

(6) Proof from Irenæus, A.D. 182-188, a disciple of Polycarp, in Book III : 2, 2 (Vol. i : 260, Clark's edition), he states that the reason why he appealed to tradition and succession was to meet the heretics on their own ground. It is also said that the tradition is preserved by the succession of presbyters. In Book III : 3, 3 (i : 261), it is said that the Apostles committed to Linus the office of the episcopate, giving also a list of Roman Bishops. In Book IV : 26, 2 (i : 261), he declares that the presbyters had succession from the Apostles—the succession of both doctrine and episcopate. In Book IV : 26, 4 (i : 463), they are said to have received apostolic doctrine and also the "ordo presbyterii." In Book IV : 26, 2 (i : 462.), he speaks of presbyters as possessing succession from the Apostles, together with the succession of the episcopate, and the certain gift of truth. And in section 5 (i : 464), he says that we must learn the truth from those who possess the "succession of the Church which is from the Apostles." In Book IV : 33, 8 (ii : 11), he speaks of both the Church and doctrine as handed down by bishops. In Book V : 20, 1 (ii : 108), he speaks of bishops to whom the Apostles committed the Church, and in the next section he calls them presbyters. In his epistle to Florinus he calls Polycarp "that blessed and apostolic presbyter." He also speaks of the Roman Bishops by name, and calls them presbyters. Indeed, Anicetus speaks of his own predecessors as presbyters (vol ii : 159-168). Irenæus uses bishop and presbyter as convertible terms,

states qualifications to be fidelity, holding apostolic doctrine, and being apt to teach. The succession of which he speaks is not derivative, but merely sequence in office. It is never mentioned as connected with ordination, but in connection with holding and handing down apostolic doctrine and apostolic polity, which was the same in all the churches. But there were evidently presbyters of a superior order, who, however, are never said to ordain, or to govern presbyters, or to confirm; but they are represented—or seem to be represented—by these eminent Roman presbyters, by Polycarp, by Irenæus himself, and by the numerous teaching presbyters of whom he speaks. In Book III: 14, 2 (vol. i: 317), it is said, "When the bishops and presbyters who came from Ephesus, and the other cities adjoining, had assembled at Miletus." Supposing it to be correct reading—as it has never been questioned—the reference is to ministers and ruling-elders. It is most shameful to quote the testimony of Irenæus in favour of "Apostolic Succession," in the sense in which these words are now used. It is equally dishonest to represent Irenæus as conveying the idea that the early Churches had a tradition from the Apostles containing truths not found in Scripture, and which are needed to supplement it.

(7) Ignatius suffered martyrdom in A.D. 107 or 114. He was not a diocesan. (See Rom. 2, Smyr. 11, Phil. 10). Eusebius in B. III: 36, gives an account of seven epistles by Ignatius:—to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Polycarp, Philadelphians, and Smyrnians. Of each of these there are two forms. There is also a brief Syriac version of the Romans, Ephesians, and Polycarp. There are other eight epistles that were not in existence when Eusebius wrote. There are very many references to Church polity in these epistles. He

writes extravagantly of the honour due to bishops, presbyters and deacons, as if the unity of the Church, and the spiritual welfare, and the salvation of the people depended upon their subjection to these officers. He constantly speaks of presbyters as the successors of the Apostles, and of the bishop as their superior, representing Christ himself. It is easy to determine, according to the principle already stated, who these officers were. The bishop's charge is invariably one congregation, having one place of meeting and one communion table, Phil. 4. "Take heed to have one Eucharist—there is one altar, one bishop," Eph. 20. "Obey the bishop and the presbytery, breaking one and the same bread," Magnes. 6. "Your bishop presides in the place of God, and your presbyters in the place of the assembly of the Apostles, along with your deacons." (See also Tral. 7, Smyr. 3-8.) The bishop must be consulted about everything, Smyr. 8, 9; Tral. 7, Mag. 7; even about marriage, Poly. 4, 5. The bishop represents the whole Church, "persona"—parson. His public duties are to preach and dispense the sacraments, and to preside over the board of presbyters. His private duties are to be the personal visitor and advisor of all the members of the congregation, to interest himself in their welfare. A Church is fully organized when it has one bishop and a number of presbyters and deacons. His Bishop is the pastor of the congregation, and his presbyters are evidently ruling-elders. His description of a Church exactly represents a presbyterian congregation. We need not be surprised at this if he wrote at the close of the Apostolic age; for he represents the Church precisely as the Apostles left it. The idea of a diocese and a diocesan seems never to have occurred to him.

(8) Proof from Tertullian, A.D. about 150-240. He

thus defines a Christian Church: "We are a body formed by our joint knowledge; by unity of discipline, by the bond of hope," *Ad. Gentes*, 39 (vol. i: 118). An Apostolic Church is one founded by an Apostle; but those more recent "are by reason of consanguinity of doctrine counted not the less apostolical." *De præ. Heret.* 32 (vol. ii: 28). "We have communion with the Apostolic Church because we have no doctrine differing from them," chap. 21. His idea of succession is precisely the same as that of Irenæus, chap. 32 (vol. ii: 24). "The most approved elders preside over us, *præsident probati quique seniores*," *Adv. Gent.*, chap 39 (vol. i: 119). "We receive baptism under the hands of the chief minister, 'antistites,' and the Lord's Supper from those of the heads of the Church, 'præsidentium,'" *De Corona*, chap. 3 (i: 336). He speaks of the pastor as the 'summus sacerdos'; he contends that the laity have a right to baptize, but should not exercise it, *De Bapt.* chap. 17, vol. i: 250.

(9) The references to Church polity by Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 200, are few, incidental and used mainly as analogies of heavenly things. In *Pæd.*, Book I, chap. vi, p. 99, he says that pastors are the leaders of the Churches, "*Prægoumenoi*." In *Stromata*, Book VI, p. 668, he says that "a man is a true Presbyter of the Church if he do and teach the things of the Lord, being enrolled in the Presbytery, although on earth he may not sit in the first seat," *i.e.*, I suppose, although he may not be moderator of the Presbytery. He says also that there are in the Church Bishops, Presbyters and deacons. In Book VII, p. 700, he says: "In most things there are two offices, one superior, the other subordinate. It is so in the Church; the Presbyters preserve the better form, the deacons the subordi-

nate." A great deal is made of a tradition in Eusebius (Book III, chap. xxiii.), and said to have been preserved by Clement, although it is not in his works. It states casually that the Apostle John, after escaping from Patmos, "went, when called, to the neighbouring regions of the Gentiles; in some to appoint Bishops, and in some to institute entire new Churches, in others to appoint to the ministry some one of those pointed out by the Holy Ghost." No one need be surprised that John renewed his Apostolic work. While he lived, and long after, Bishop was used in the New Testament sense. Besides, the person addressed as a Bishop is called in the next sentence a Presbyter. This is a very slender foundation for the opinion that John, after the death of all the other Apostles, changed the polity which they had instituted, and established prelacy in Asia.

NOTE.—The correctness of the testimony of the early Fathers now presented is confirmed by Jerome and Hilary, in the end of the fourth century, when a modified Episcopacy existed, to the effect that a change had been made in the polity of the Apostles. Jerome, on Titus i., declares and proves "that Presbyters and Bishops were the same in the Apostolic age, and that it was not till parties were formed in the Church, and to put an end to schism, that one chosen from among the Presbyters should be put over the rest, and that the whole care of the Church should be committed to him, and that the seeds of schism should be taken away. That by little and little the plants of dissension might be plucked up, the whole concern was devolved on one individual. As Presbyters therefore know that they are subjected, by the custom of the Church, to him who is set over them, so let the Bishops know that they are greater than Presbyters more by custom than by any real appointment of Christ." Hilary, on I Cor. xii: 28, 29, says: "Because all things are from one God, the

Father. He decreed that one Bishop should be over each Church—singulos episcopos singulis ecclesiis decrevit;” the Bishops therefore were pastors. On Eph. iv: 11: “After Churches were formed in all places and officers were constituted, matters were arranged otherwise than at the beginning. The Church began to be governed by another order and foresight. The Apostles do not agree with the ordination which is now in the Church, because their writings were written at the commencement. On I Tim. iii., he says that the ordination of a Presbyter is not mentioned after that of a Bishop, as that of Presbyter and Bishop is one.”